

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 594

CG 014 755

AUTHOR Krusemark, Fred; Dege, Dolores  
TITLE Project BORN FREE. Evaluation of Educational Change Process and Project Impact in BORN FREE Institutions, 1977-1978. Technical Report No. 8.  
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Coll. of Education.  
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.  
PUB DATE Nov 78  
NOTE 197p.: For related documents see CG 014 752-757 and ED 150 493-495.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Careers; \*Change Strategies; \*Educational Change; Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Evaluation Methods; Followup Studies; \*Institutional Evaluation; Postsecondary Education; Program Descriptions; \*Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; \*Sex Stereotypes

IDENTIFIERS \*Project BORN FREE

## ABSTRACT

BORN FREE is a project designed as a collaborative effort of university-based counseling psychologists and field-site educators to reduce career-related sex stereotyping in 14 educational institutions. This is the second year evaluation of the project. The report introduction states the purpose and organization of the report, describes the project, gives an overview of evaluation components and activities, and describes the 14 participating institutions. In the section, Conceptual Design of Second-Year Change Process Evaluation, the goals, assumptions, and operationalization of the change process evaluation are discussed. Methodologies for Second-Year Change Process Evaluation describes the methodologies related to the collection and analysis of change process evaluation data. The Summary and Analysis of Second-Year Change Process Evaluation Data presents and discusses evaluation data. The contents of the report are summarized in the Conclusions and Recommendations. Tentative conclusions and recommendations are presented which concern the process of attempting change in educational institutions and the evaluation of change efforts such as those attempted through Project BORN FREE. Appendices contain a listing of BORN FREE products and publications, second-year evaluation components, evaluation instruments and administration guidelines, and supplemental evaluation data tables. (Author/NRE)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

ED193594

Project BORN FREE

L. Sunny Hansen, Ph. D.  
Director

EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE PROCESS  
AND PROJECT IMPACT IN BORN FREE  
INSTITUTIONS, 1977-1978



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Tara S. L. Berry*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Fred Krusemark, Evaluator

With Contributions by

Dolores Dege, Project Assistant

Technical Report No. 8

November, 1978

Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology  
Department of Psychoeducational Studies  
College of Education  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

CG 014755



The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

## PREFACE

Project BORN FREE is a multi-faceted program designed to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in educational institutions. The primary focus has been to develop and field test print and video training materials and designs for use with educators and parents. A secondary focus has been to use the materials and training models to effect change in faculty attitudes and behavior in the 14 pilot institutions. To attempt to do this with an extremely competent but only part-time staff in a two-year period has been a monumental task.

Much has been learned in a short time about dealing with problems of sex-role stereotyping in career options. Resistance to working on a problem which is threatening to some individuals manifested itself in a variety of ways. Sex-role issues are perhaps understandably of low priority to those faculty concerned about retrenchment, budget cuts, and survival in their jobs. Nonetheless, in spite of the inhibitors, considerable progress has been made in helping faculty members become more aware of the issues and in increasing their efforts to do something about the problems as identified in their own institution. The amount of implementation activity generated in a nine-month period is in itself remarkable.

Within the limits of the Project evaluation design, the three evaluators were given considerable freedom in the way they carried out the tasks. Above all, they were asked to keep the tasks manageable. For whatever reasons, it may be apparent from this report that the task became unmanageable for a half-time evaluator. There was not time for complete data analysis. It is hoped that in spite of the limitations inherent in studying change process and evident in this report, the descriptions of faculty attitudes and

OCT 6 1980

behavior at the end of the first two years of BORN FREE will be useful to those considering introducing BORN FREE programs in their institutions. There is much that can be learned from our experience, from this report and from first-year change process reports.

This report, one of three which deal with Project BORN FREE evaluation during the second year, has been a difficult one to bring to closure. As with other parts of the Project, the evaluation tasks have been so demanding and the staff so limited that it has been impossible to adequately evaluate all aspects of the Project.

Fred Krusemark, the second-year change process evaluator, gave a great deal of time, effort, and energy to the evaluation tasks of Project BORN FREE. He is chiefly responsible for this report, having done all of the data collection and analysis and written the first draft of the first four chapters. His Project Impact Questionnaire and tables developed from it are especially useful. He created several instruments used for process evaluation and wrote thorough detailed guidelines and letters for those who were to complete the various forms. Along with the rest of the staff, he assisted with non-evaluation tasks in time of pressure or deadlines. He also assisted with formative evaluation of the National Institute. As did the rest of the staff, he donated many hours to evaluation tasks beyond the formal ending of his appointment and the Project. For all of these, we are grateful.

The last chapter and revised report were completed by Dolores Dege, Project Assistant, and by the Project Director. The tentative nature of the findings of this change process and impact evaluation is stated throughout this report. Although results must be viewed with caution, the evaluation design, methodologies, and procedures should be useful to those undertaking change agent projects in the

area of sex-role stereotyping and career options in their own institutions.

Several acknowledgements are in order to those who have contributed to the completion of this document:

- to Dolores Dege for contributions to the last chapter and her editorial assistance
- to Phillip D. Penn for assistance in computer analysis
- to Terry Roiger and Barbara Lutz for skillful typing of the report and tables
- to Shelly Heck for carefully monitoring the report through its final phases and assisting with organization, typing, and reproduction.

A word of thanks must be expressed to the Women's Educational Equity Act Program, without whose support this Project would not be possible. Appreciation is also expressed to the Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology Program, the Psychoeducational Studies Department, and the College of Education, University of Minnesota, for both financial support and encouragement.

Finally special appreciation is expressed to the 14 field sites' administrators, teachers, and counselors who have participated in Project BORN FREE for their cooperation in all phases of the Project. We are especially grateful to all who have been involved and have been willing to complete the many evaluation forms to help us determine the effectiveness of our products and process. We hope that their contribution to reducing sex bias in career options for girls and boys, men and women is recognized.

L. Sunny Hansen, Ph.D.  
Professor and Director  
Project BORN FREE  
November 1978



# LIST OF TABLES

| Table                                                                                                                                                                 | Page |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1. Listing of Second Year (1978-79 School Year)<br>BORN FREE Implementation Activities/Accomplishments<br>at Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels) . . . . .            | 43   |
| 2. Project Impact Questionnaire Response Rates<br>for Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels) . . . . .                                                                   | 52   |
| 3. Total (All Sites) Responses to Project Impact<br>Questionnaire (In Percentages) . . . . .                                                                          | 55   |
| 4. Estimated Number of Faculty/Staff Across All Sites<br>Impacted upon by Project BORN FREE . . . . .                                                                 | 57   |
| 5. Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Elementary<br>Sites on Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire . . . . .                                              | 59   |
| 6. Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Junior High<br>Sites on Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire . . . . .                                             | 61   |
| 7. Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Senior High<br>Sites on Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire . . . . .                                             | 63   |
| 8. Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Postsecondary<br>Sites on Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire . . . . .                                           | 65   |
| 9. Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Sites Within<br>Greenwood School District on Responses to Project<br>Impact Questionnaire . . . . .                     | 68   |
| 10. Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Sites Within<br>Jackson School District on Responses to Project<br>Impact Questionnaire . . . . .                      | 69   |
| 11. Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Sites Within<br>Suburban Park School District on Responses to<br>Project Impact Questionnaire . . . . .                | 71   |
| 12. Summary of T-Tests for Differences Between Total<br>(All Sites) Team Member and Nonmember Responses<br>on Project Impact Questionnaire . . . . .                  | 73   |
| 13. Summary of T-Tests for Differences Between Total<br>(All Sites) Female and Male Responses on Project<br>Impact Questionnaire . . . . .                            | 74   |
| 14. Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Project<br>Impact Questionnaire Responses of Teachers,<br>Administrators, Counselors and Other Faculty/Staff . . . . . | 76   |
| 15. Means and Standard Deviations (SD) of Change Process<br>Variables . . . . .                                                                                       | 79   |

## CONTENTS

|                                                                                                 | <u>Page</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Preface                                                                                         |             |
| List of Tables                                                                                  |             |
| I. Introduction . . . . .                                                                       | 1           |
| Description of Project BORN FREE . . . . .                                                      | 1           |
| Purpose of Report . . . . .                                                                     | 3           |
| Organization of Report . . . . .                                                                | 4           |
| Overview of Project Evaluation . . . . .                                                        | 6           |
| Description of Local Educational Institutions<br>Collaborating with Project BORN FREE . . . . . | 16          |
| Summary . . . . .                                                                               | 21          |
| II. Conceptual Design of Second-Year Change Process Evaluation . . . . .                        | 22          |
| Goals . . . . .                                                                                 | 22          |
| Assumptions . . . . .                                                                           | 23          |
| Operationalization of Conceptual Design . . . . .                                               | 25          |
| III. Methodologies for Second-Year Change Process Evaluation. . . . .                           | 29          |
| Data Collection Methodology . . . . .                                                           | 29          |
| Data Analysis Methodology . . . . .                                                             | 36          |
| IV. Summary and Analysis of Second-Year Change Process<br>Evaluation Data . . . . .             | 41          |
| Second-Year BORN FREE Implementation Activities . . . . .                                       | 41          |
| Impact of BORN FREE Implementation Activities . . . . .                                         | 42          |
| Description of Tables . . . . .                                                                 | 53          |
| Description of Change Process Variables . . . . .                                               | 75          |
| V. Conclusions . . . . .                                                                        | 82          |
| Summary and Discussion . . . . .                                                                | 82          |
| Conceptual Design . . . . .                                                                     | 83          |
| Methodologies for Second-Year Change Process<br>Evaluation . . . . .                            | 85          |
| Summary and Analysis of Second-Year Change Process<br>Evaluation Data . . . . .                 | 87          |
| Continuation . . . . .                                                                          | 89          |
| Change Process Study . . . . .                                                                  | 90          |
| Subjective Indicators of Project Change . . . . .                                               | 92          |
| Conclusion . . . . .                                                                            | 94          |
| References . . . . .                                                                            | 97          |
| Appendix . . . . .                                                                              | 98          |

## I. Introduction

### Description of Project BORN FREE

BORN FREE is a training and development grant to broaden the range of career options for both women and men. Funded through the Women's Educational Equity Act Program, U.S. Office of Education, the program aims to create transportable career development training modules (training packets, workshop designs, nine color videotapes, and viewers' guides) for parents, teachers, counselors, and administrators at all educational levels, kindergarten through higher education. The shortened title of Project BORN FREE is an acronym that expresses exactly what the Project is about: Build Options, Reassess Norms, Free Roles through Educational Equity.

The 14 schools and higher education institutions participating in the Project are Lincoln Elementary, Sunrise Junior High, and Mariner High School in White Bear Lake; Webster Elementary, Mounds Park Junior High, and Washington High School (replacing the St. Paul Open School which participated in the Project during the first year) in St. Paul; Harley Hopkins Elementary, North Junior High, and Eisenhower High School in Hopkins. The higher education institutions involved in BORN FREE are Lakewood Community College and 916 Vocational-Technical Institute in White Bear Lake; Normandale Community College in Bloomington; the CLA Career Planning Office (University of Minnesota); and Augsburg College in Minneapolis.

During the first year of Project operation, teams of teachers/professors and counselors/student personnel workers were named in each setting to identify needs and assess the career-related sex-role stereotyping in existence. Together with Project staff from the University, primarily graduate students in Counseling and

Student Personnel Psychology (CSPP), teams produced training materials to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in educational institutions. These materials and one completed videotape, "A World of Options," were field-tested at a local BORN FREE Summer Institute in 1977 at the University of Minnesota. Forty counselors, teachers, and administrators from the 14 institutions participating in BORN FREE attended the two-week Institute.

In the second year of Project operation, the 40 participants from the local Summer Institute worked with the field site members from the first year to implement BORN FREE activities in their respective schools and colleges. These activities have included inservice workshops and field testing BORN FREE training materials.

The University of Minnesota staff served as consultants to the field site teams during BORN FREE's second year. In addition, the staff revised the field-tested training materials and completed the remaining videotapes. The University staff has consisted of a Director, two Administrative Assistants, one General Project Assistant, three Project Assistants/Consultants, one Media Specialist, three Evaluators, a full-time Secretary, and a part-time Clerk-typist. All of the staff except the Secretary had part-time appointments.

A BORN FREE National Institute was held June, 1978, at the University of Minnesota. Over 100 educators were selected to attend the Institute. According to the original plan for the Institute, each state was to be represented by one counselor and one instructor or administrator from various developmental levels, kindergarten through higher education. This plan was followed, for the most part, although the composition of the group varied somewhat due



to the variability in the quality and quantity of applications received from each state. The revised training materials and eight of the nine videotapes were field tested with this national group of educators. Upon their return home, the National Institute participants have begun to implement plans for integrating the BORN FREE goals and materials into their respective states and/or institutions. Each state implementation plan was a collaborative effort on the part of all participants from that respective state. For more details on Project BORN FREE (rationale, assumptions, first and second year activities, etc.), see the abstract provided in Appendix A. For a listing of available BORN FREE products and publications, see Appendix B.

#### Purpose of Report

This report is one of three technical reports, each of which describes a specific evaluation area or component of Project BORN FREE during its second and final year of funding. The specific evaluation area addressed here is the Project implementation or change process occurring at the 14 local collaborating educational institutions where teams of teachers, counselors, and administrators implemented various BORN FREE activities during the second year of the Project.

The two primary purposes of this report are to (1) document or describe the second-year change process evaluation design and methodologies, and (2) present and discuss the evaluation data collected on the implementation activities undertaken during the second year, Project impact at collaborating institutions, and the change process variables operating at the institutions. A third purpose is to provide tentative conclusions and recommendations

regarding both how to attempt change in educational institutions and also how to evaluate such change agent efforts as BORN FREE.

The primary audience of this report is Project BORN FREE's funding source, the Women's Educational Equity Act Program, U.S. Office of Education, who must make a final judgment concerning the overall worth of Project BORN FREE. It is hoped that the information presented will aid the relevant decision makers in this judgment and that future projects funded through this source will indirectly benefit from the experiences of Project BORN FREE. A secondary, more general audience of this report are persons directing, implementing, and especially evaluating similar change agent efforts or projects designed to train educators in regard to sensitive issues such as sex and race equity. For these persons, it is hoped the conceptual design of the change process evaluation and the data collection and analysis methodologies, including the various evaluative instruments, can be used or adapted in a variety of settings.

#### Organization of Report

This report is organized into five sections:

- 1) Introduction
- 2) Conceptual Design of Second-Year Change Process Evaluation
- 3) Methodologies for Second-Year Change Process Evaluation
- 4) Summary and Analysis of Second-Year Change Process Evaluation Data
- 5) Conclusions and Recommendations.

In this section, Introduction, the purpose and organization of this report are stated; a brief description of Project BORN FREE

In the fifth section, Conclusions and Recommendations, the contents of the report are summarized and tentative conclusions and recommendations are given which concern both (1) the process of attempting change in educational institutions, and (2) the evaluation of change agent efforts such as attempted through Project BORN FREE.

#### Overview of Project Evaluation

Throughout the two years of Project BORN FREE, systematic evaluation has played a major role. The Project was evaluated both internally by a team of evaluators and externally by a process evaluator contracted by the Women's Educational Equity Program to study BORN FREE as one of nine case study projects (Fernandes, 1978).

The BORN FREE overall evaluation design has been divided into three major components: (1) Product Evaluation; (2) Change Process Evaluation<sup>1</sup>; and (3) BORN FREE Training Institute Evaluation. Obviously, while these three aspects have been treated as independent and distinct, each with different evaluation goals and methodologies, there is considerable overlap among them, e.g., when field testing Project materials at local institutions and at the BORN FREE training institutes. These three evaluation components are described in several technical reports and provide a comprehensive picture of Project BORN FREE.

In a project of this scope, size, and duration, it was not

---

<sup>1</sup>This component was not intended for the first year of the Project but was started earlier than intended because several of the participating institutions began implementation activities ahead of the timeline. A decision was made to use the Rand Model of educational change in federal innovative projects (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974) as a framework for the change process evaluation.

is given; an overview of the Project evaluation components and activities is given; and brief descriptions of the 14 local institutions collaborating with BORN FREE are provided.

In the second section, Conceptual Design of Second-Year Change Process Evaluation, the goals, assumptions, and operationalization of the change process evaluation are described and discussed. Differences between the first and second-year change process evaluation will be discussed along with apparent limitations.

In the third section, Methodologies for Second-Year Change Process Evaluation, the methodologies related to the collection and analysis of change process evaluation data are separately discussed. Appendix C contains the various evaluation instruments and accompanying administration guidelines which are described in this chapter.

In the fourth section, Summary and Analysis of Second-Year Change Process Evaluation Data, the change process evaluation data are presented and discussed. The data include: a listing of second-year BORN FREE implementation activities at each of the 14 collaborating institutions; results of a questionnaire administered to faculty/staff at these institutions to measure Project impact and continuation support; a listing and description of 51 change process variables (characteristics of project, institution, team, and implementation) operating at the collaborating institutions; and correlations between change process variables and between change process variables and questionnaire responses. Additional change process evaluation data referred to but not discussed in section four are provided in Appendix D.



possible to evaluate all aspects. Therefore, certain areas of possible Project impact have not been included within these components. These omissions are intentional trade-offs, due to severe limitations in resources available. One deliberate omission in the formal evaluation is the public relations and information sharing efforts of the Project staff at the University; these are described in the Annual and Final Report (Hansen and Mills-Novoa, 1978). Evaluation relating to the internal dynamics both at the Project headquarters and in field sites could have generated much useful information, but resources for such a systematic study were not available. Some internal process data are available--a case study report on the Project completed by the American Institutes for Research (Fernandes, 1978), as well as in the Project quarterly and final reports.

Before briefly summarizing first and second year activities for each of the three evaluation components, the report provides an overall description of the Project evaluation for each of the two years.

First year. In the first year of the Project, the internal evaluation team consisted of two .25 time evaluators. One evaluator was responsible for product evaluation, i.e., the evaluation of Project materials developed; while the other evaluator was responsible for change process evaluation and BORN FREE Training Institute evaluation. As it turned out, the development of Project materials progressed more slowly than expected, and the change process evaluation proved to be more time consuming than originally expected. The change process and Institute

evaluator worked many hours beyond the time allotted to his .25 position. Despite the enormity of evaluation tasks, first-year technical reports concerning product evaluation and BORN FREE Training Institute evaluations were completed by the first quarter of the second year. The technical reports on change process evaluation were completed the second quarter of the second year.

Second year. In the second year of the Project, the internal staff consisted of two .50 time evaluators and one .25 time evaluator. The division of tasks remained essentially the same as in the first year, except that the allotted time for evaluation was nearly tripled, and a .25 time evaluator was brought in to assist the other two evaluators in conducting computer analyses and writing needed quarterly and technical reports. While the same internal evaluator was responsible for product evaluation in the first and second years, the first-year change process evaluator resigned at the end of the first year to work on his dissertation, and a new change process evaluator was hired. The transition created some difficulties due in part to the different conceptualizations and evaluation styles of the two process evaluators. Despite the difficulties related to the change in staff, the evaluation design was carried out with some modifications in the second year. A listing of the goals/purposes and procedures/instruments used for each of the three components in the second-year evaluation is provided in Appendix C.

In addition to the tasks related to the three evaluation components, the evaluators were responsible for conducting a

follow-up evaluation of the Institute held the previous summer, of all-Project meetings, and of the BORN FREE Dean's Seminars with College of Education faculty. Besides these evaluation tasks, the evaluators assisted, along with other staff, in non-evaluation tasks, such as presentations, writing videotape viewers' guides, and tasks related to the National Training Institute.

Product evaluation. During the first year of the Project, product evaluation was limited because Project materials were under development for most of the year. The three developmental level training packets, along with the first videotape, were available just prior to the Local BORN FREE Training Institute held in June, 1977. Nearly all of the first-year product evaluation occurred in the Institute and after. All participants experienced and evaluated selected learning activities or strategies from the training packets and also the first videotape. Product evaluation was separate from the institute evaluation and used a specially developed evaluation form for rating individual learning activities and the videotape. In addition, certain participants read and critiqued the entire contents of the packets. Shortly after the Institute, appropriate developmental level training packets were sent to local and national reviewers to critique the training packet for educators at their level. These efforts comprised the first-year product evaluation activities. See Project BORN FREE Evaluation Report on Field Testing of Color Video Cassette and Training Packets, Technical Report, No. 4 (Warsett, 1977) for further details.

During the second year, product evaluation was a major focus of the total Project evaluation and entailed considerable effort and activity. Product evaluation forms were revised, and some additional forms and reports were created. A design for field testing Project materials was developed and implemented with partial success. The original design called for formal field testing to take place in the local collaborating institutions, but because of national interest in the Project, it was decided to expand the field testing to external institutions. While the materials were field tested or used at a number of external sites, very few institutions completed the accompanying evaluation forms and reports, despite repeated requests for data.

Another problem that severely limited the field testing of Project materials was the delay in production of the remaining videotapes. As a result, only the first three videotapes were available for field testing prior to the National Training Institute in June. Eight of the nine color videotapes were, however, evaluated by the participants of the Institute. As in the case of the Local BORN FREE Training Institute, product evaluation was separate from the Institute evaluation, with participants completing separate evaluation forms rating each videotape viewed. Despite the setbacks related to the nonavailability of videotapes and unexpected field test problems, considerable data have been collected and used in revising the materials and determining the appropriateness of the Project materials for various audiences. For further information concerning the second-year product evalua-



tion, see Project BORN FREE Evaluation Report on Field Testing of Videotape, Training Packets, and Selected Workshops, Technical Report No. 9 (Warsett, 1978).

Change process evaluation. Originally the change process evaluation was concerned primarily with monitoring completion of tasks related to the development of Project materials--specifically, the three developmental level training packets. These tasks included: (1) systems diagnosis of each collaborating institution conducted by the two internal faculty/staff working with BORN FREE; (2) developmental level literature reviews prepared by BORN FREE University staff; and (3) writing the developmental level training packets by both BORN FREE University staff and the BORN FREE teams at the institutions. Progress related to these tasks was monitored through regular logs or activity reports submitted by all BORN FREE staff.

Early in the first year, it became apparent that BORN FREE already was having some unexpected positive and negative impact at the collaborating institutions. Also apparent was that several crucial institutional changes were exerting considerable influence on the progress BORN FREE could achieve at these institutions during the first and second years. In light of these developments, the outside process evaluator suggested modifying the evaluation so that it would document Project impact the first year. Following through on this suggestion, the Director decided to use the Rand Model of educational change in federal innovative projects as the framework for studying change process in the field sites. The process evaluator adapted the Rand Model of initiation, implementa-

tion, and outcomes and continuation to identify both Project and institutional characteristics whose interactions constituted the change process. This adaptation is described in Technical Report No. 6 (Keierleber and Hansen, 1978). In order to collect additional data needed in the last quarter, the change process evaluator conducted several interviews with the Project Director, University staff, and field site staff. Additional data sources used were each institution's systems diagnosis and the second-year implementation plans developed by the educators from each institution who attended the 1977 BORN FREE Summer Institute. Due to the nature of the change process evaluation data collected, quantitative analysis was not possible, nor was such an analysis thought to be appropriate. For a summary of results and further details concerning the first-year change process evaluation, see Evaluation of Educational Change Process in Project BORN FREE Institutions 1976-1977, Technical Report No. 6 (Keierleber and Hansen, 1978) and Case Summaries of Educational Change Process in Project BORN FREE Institutions, Technical Report No. 7 (Keierleber, 1978).

While the second year change process evaluation closely followed the first year's evaluation, there were certain changes made relating to both evaluation goals and methodologies. These modifications were due partly to the shift in change process evaluators, but were primarily due to different evaluation needs for each year. In the first year, it made sense to study the initiation of the change process at the collaborating institutions as a few BORN FREE orientation activities began to occur; in the second year, major systematic implementation activities, including

field tests of Project materials, were planned at each institution. Therefore, the second-year change process evaluation gave primary focus to documenting the actual implementation activities occurring at the institutions and to determining the impact of these activities. The study of change process in the second year focused on the implementation, outcome and continuation phases of the Rand Model.

As in the first year, much of the second-year change process evaluation data was collected through regular reports submitted by the Project Director, developmental level consultants, and BORN FREE team leaders at collaborating institutions. Interviews with these persons were also conducted throughout the second year.

While the second-year reports and interviews were similar in purpose to those of the first year, new forms were developed and differed substantially in format from earlier ones. Another difference was that during the second year an attempt was made to collect detailed evaluation data of each major activity conducted in the collaborating institutions through a major activity report and a standardized participant evaluation form for BORN FREE workshops/in-services. Also different from the first year's evaluation, a new questionnaire was administered at the end of the second year to faculty/staff at 12 of the 14 collaborating institutions. Its purpose was to measure the impact of BORN FREE at these institutions and also the amount of faculty/staff support for BORN FREE continuation. Finally, while the first-year change process evaluation included only qualitative analysis, the second-year change process evaluation included both qualitative and

quantitative analyses. The quantitative analyses were performed with the Project Impact Questionnaire data and also the data available on change process.

BORN FREE Training Institute evaluations. Evaluation of the Local BORN FREE Summer Institute held in June, 1977, provided the first testing of the adequacy of the BORN FREE training workshop model. The evaluation attempted not only to measure the impact of the Institute on the participants (e.g., knowledge gains, attitude changes, and skill gains), but also examined the overall organization and specific elements to identify strengths and weaknesses for future revisions of the model.

The Institute evaluation consisted of administering pre- and post-workshop assessment questionnaires developed by the evaluators. Certain items (participants' perceived level of knowledge, attitudes, perceived skills) were listed on both questionnaires and were analyzed for pre- and post-workshop differences. The bulk of the post-workshop assessment questionnaire was administered to participants in May, 1978, as a follow-up evaluation of the training. This follow-up was intended to determine the reliability or stability of the participant ratings and opinions concerning the Institute. For further information on evaluation of the first year's Local Institute, see Evaluation of the 1977 BORN FREE Summer Institute: A Workshop Model to Reduce Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping, Technical Report No. 5 (Keierleber, 1977). For information on the follow-up evaluation of the Institute, see appropriate section in Project BORN FREE Year II



Third Quarterly Report (Hansen and Mills-Nowa, 1978) and Technical Report No. 9 (Warsett, 1978).

The BORN FREE National Institute carried out the second year was another major evaluation task. Although the evaluation was conceptualized and handled by the second-year change process evaluator (drawing heavily on the experience of the first Institute evaluation), the post-Institute data analysis and technical report writing were completed by the .25 time Project Evaluator. Based on recommendations from the first year's Institute evaluation and an informal needs assessment of participants, the BORN FREE model was revised, and a second testing occurred with the evaluation of the National BORN FREE Training Institute in June, 1978. The second-year Institute evaluation goals remained essentially the same as those cited in the first year. However, an additional goal was to provide continual feedback on Institute functioning in order that modifications could be made as needed.

The data collection methodologies for the first- and second-year Institute evaluations differed in that methodologies besides the shortened, revised pre- and post-Institute assessment questionnaires were employed in the second year. These additional methodologies included: a separate retreat evaluation form, daily reports submitted by Institute staff, and participant observations by Project evaluators. While all of the data analysis in the first year occurred after the Institute, much preliminary data analysis (retreat evaluation and staff reports) was conducted during the second Institute, providing immediate feedback for making any training design revisions. Many revisions were made as a result

of this feedback. As in the first year, a follow-up evaluation of the National BORN FREE Training Institute is planned for December, 1978. For further information on the National Institute Evaluation, see Evaluation of the National BORN FREE Training Institute: A Workshop to Reduce Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping, Technical Report No. 10 (Pern, 1978).

Description of Local Educational Institutions Collaborating with Project BORN FREE

As indicated earlier, 14 local educational institutions have collaborated with Project BORN FREE in the Project's two years of operation. These institutions include: elementary, junior high, and senior high schools in three different school districts (nine schools); a public vocational-technical institute; two public community colleges; a private liberal arts college; and the college of liberal arts at a major state university. These institutions will be identified and briefly described below. The elementary schools, junior highs, and senior highs will be discussed by school districts. In order to preserve the anonymity of each institution's identity, fictitious names are used for institutions and school districts as was done in earlier change process evaluation technical reports. For detailed descriptions of collaborating institutions, see Case Summaries of Educational Change Process in Project BORN FREE Institutions, Technical Report No. 7 (Keierleber, 1978).

The first school district, Greenwood School District, is located within a suburban community and is probably the smallest of the three school districts. Not unique to this school district, declining student enrollments, particularly at the secondary level,

have brought on drastic retrenchments across all schools in the district. One of the three junior highs was closed in the first year of the Project. Historically, few district-wide efforts or programs on career development/education have existed, and the district has been relatively unreceptive to Affirmative Action needs. The three collaborating institutions within Greenwood School District are Carson Elementary School, Middleton Junior High School, and Morningside Senior High School. All three schools in this district might be considered as fairly traditional in educational orientation, though Carson Elementary and Middleton Junior High Schools have shown a propensity to attempt innovative programs. Due to perceived high faculty resistance to BORN FREE goals, lack of administrative support, and institutional crises present at Morningside Senior High School, little progress was expected during the second year. Due to the close proximity between Middleton Junior High and Morningside Senior High Schools, it was expected that joint school efforts and cooperation would occur.

The second district, Jackson School District, is an urban school district which is by far the largest of the three. Jackson School District has had a fairly active career education program for its system for several years, partly as one method to achieve a racial balance in its schools. The three collaborating institutions within Jackson School District are Norwood Elementary, Linden Junior High, and Bellevue Senior High Schools. Unlike all other collaborating institutions, Bellevue was a second-year replacement school for Riverside Open School which represented the senior high

level for the district during the first year. Of the three institutions, Norwood Elementary is the most unique school in the district since it is an experimental school in an inner city area and has a very progressive educational philosophy. Norwood Elementary also enrolls students from all sections of the city of Jackson. Linden Junior High School, like most other Jackson junior high schools, has a fairly traditional educational orientation. Linden is located in an area with families primarily within the lower socioeconomic levels. Bellevue Senior High School, the replacement school, is currently in a state of flux allowing little possibility for Project impact. Just prior to Bellevue's involvement with Project BORN FREE, another Jackson senior high school was closed and most of its faculty were transferred to Bellevue. Although this fact was not known at the time the school was selected for Project participation, the 1977-1978 school year was the last year of operation for Bellevue Senior High School; it is currently being remodeled into a new junior high school.

The third school district, Suburban Park School District, is located in another suburban community which has a diverse population. One major section of the community is relatively affluent, while another section is older with predominantly blue collar families.

The Suburban Park schools, including the institutions collaborating with BORN FREE, reflect this diversity. The three collaborating institutions are Glenwood Elementary, Valley View Junior High, and Central High School. Unlike the secondary schools collaborating with BORN FREE, Glenwood Elementary School has a traditional educa-



tional orientation. Both Valley View Junior High School and Central Senior High School are located close to one another and are in the more affluent section of Suburban Park. Valley View Junior High could be considered a moderately progressive school, with some newer programs for student development. Its principal is female. Central Senior High School is a relatively new school established with a very progressive "open school" philosophy and has many unique, innovative programs. Unfortunately, with student enrollment declining rapidly at the secondary level in Suburban Park School District, retrenchments have affected and will continue to affect Central Senior High, which, because of its newness, is the most vulnerable of the secondary schools in Suburban Park School District.

Oak Creek Vocational-Technical Institute, the postsecondary vocational school collaborating with BORN FREE, is located in the Suburban Park area. Oak Creek Vo-Tech serves several surrounding communities in addition to the Suburban Park area. It is one of the larger postsecondary vocational-technical schools in the state and offers a wide variety of training programs, most of which are traditional in nature. Oak Creek Vo-Tech has received some degree of national recognition as a model school because of its exclusive use of individualized instructional methods.

The two community colleges collaborating with BORN FREE are West City Community College and Northtown Community College. Both are located in suburban areas and were established in the late 1960's. West City Community College is across the road from Oak Creek Vo-Tech. West City Community College has had active and

expanding programs and curriculum offerings for student career development and also has sponsored several programs concerning women's issues because of high interest on the part of several female faculty/staff and students. While Northtown Community College is perhaps not as progressive in its educational philosophy as West City, it also has had active career development programs and curriculum offerings for students.

The two four-year colleges collaborating with BORN FREE include Parkside College and the College of Liberal Arts at Midwestern University. Parkside College is a small, private, religious-affiliated institution located near Midwestern University in the central part of one of the two metropolitan areas. BORN FREE efforts at Parkside College emanated from the Center for Student Development. As at Parkside College, because of the size of both Midwestern University and its large College of Liberal Arts, BORN FREE efforts have been localized within selected student service offices, e.g., Career Planning Office, Office for Special Learning Opportunities, and various undergraduate advising offices. While the location of BORN FREE efforts at both Parkside College and Midwestern University facilitated impact with counseling staff and students, it limited the possible impact on faculty. Declining student enrollments within the College of Liberal Arts at Midwestern University have caused drastic retrenchments in student services and course offerings. These retrenchments have caused and are likely to continue to cause much resistance to BORN FREE, similar to the resistance encountered in secondary schools collaborating with BORN FREE.

### Summary

This chapter has provided a brief introduction to Project BORN FREE and to this evaluation report as part of the larger evaluation design. An overview has been provided of the evaluation design for the first two years and of ways in which it has been modified. The three major evaluation components are described: the product evaluation, change process and impact evaluation, and training model evaluation. Finally, the 14 schools and colleges which have collaborated in developing materials and implementation plans are described.

## II. Conceptual Design of Second-Year Change Process Evaluation

In this section, various facets of the conceptual design for the second year change process evaluation are discussed. These facets include the goals, assumptions, and the operationalization of the conceptual design. Each of these areas is discussed separately.

### Goals

There are essentially five goals related to the second year change process evaluation. These are:

- 1) Monitor the implementation progress at each of the fourteen local collaborating educational institutions
- 2) Record significant or major BORN FREE implementation activities that have occurred at each collaborating institution
- 3) Measure the impacts or changes resulting from the BORN FREE implementation activities and chances for continuation
- 4) Identify and describe change process variables operating at collaborating institutions which affect implementation progress
- 5) Draw conclusions and make recommendations concerning the process of attempting innovative change in educational institutions.

While the above goals are quite similar to the change process evaluation goals in the first year, certain differences exist. In the first year, the primary evaluation goal was to study the initiation of the change process occurring at the collaborating institutions along with the few BORN FREE orientation activities which began to occur. During the second year, in which considerable BORN FREE implementation activity occurred, the primary evaluation goals were to document the actual BORN FREE implementation activities occurring, to measure the impact or changes resulting



from these activities, and to determine plans for continuation. The study of change process, per se, identifying and describing change process variables (Project, institutional, team and implementation characteristics) operating at institutions, was included in the second year, but received lesser emphasis.

### Assumptions

The assumptions related to the second year change process evaluation fall into two categories: (1) assumptions concerning the process of attempting change in educational institutions, and (2) assumptions concerning change process evaluation methodology.

The first category contains several assumptions which are listed below. Identified in the first year, they were generated from the work of two primary sources. The first source is the major, multi-year, federally funded study by the Rand Corporation to examine various federal programs designed to introduce and spread innovative practices in public schools (Berman and McLaughlin, 1974; Berman and McLaughlin, 1975; Berman and McLaughlin, 1977; Greenwood, Mann and McLaughlin, 1975; Mann, 1976). The results and conclusions of the Rand study have served as a conceptual foundation and model for BORN FREE change process evaluation. Another source used in generating assumptions about the change process has been the work of Havelock (1973). Havelock's work stresses the importance of the initial stage of implementing change, e.g., gaining initial support and problem ownership. According to the Rand report:

- 1) The change process can be broken down into three distinct stages: initiation, implementation and institutionalization (outcome/continuation). While these stages have different

relevant concerns, the stages are related in that successes or problems in earlier stages will affect what happens in later stages.

- 2) The process of educational change is not a straightforward application of new theory or technology resulting in immediate changes in the institution, but is rather a dialectical process of mutual adaptations between the innovative change agent (Project) and an institution.
- 3) The change process is a complex process which entails the interactions of several variables: Project characteristics, team (internal change agents) characteristics, and implementation characteristics. Each of these variables, particularly institutional characteristics, can have a profound influence on the degree of change or impact resulting from implementation.
- 4) It is not possible to identify or anticipate all possible change process variables and their effects, nor can the course of implementation be confidently or completely anticipated.
- 5) Each educational institution has a unique constellation of change process variables and, thus, standardized implementation methods will not necessarily produce the same changes or impacts across different institutions.
- 6) While BORN FREE teams (internal change agents) need a certain amount of assistance and structure, each team should have autonomy and flexibility in developing and conducting their implementation activities.
- 7) Without clear support and/or endorsement for innovative change by key and influential persons in institutions (administration, department heads), implementation and impact are not likely.

The second category of assumptions concerning the change process evaluation also contains several assumptions which are listed below.

- 1) Evaluation design should be a flexible one, changing and adapting where appropriate.
- 2) Evaluation of BORN FREE implementation should occur simultaneously with the implementation activities, not after the fact.
- 3) Both qualitative and quantitative analyses are appropriate for change process evaluation.

- 4) Original or direct data sources are likely to provide more valid and reliable data than secondary, indirect sources.
- 5) Each evaluation methodology or data source entails a specific type of bias, thus, multiple methodologies and sources should be used to corroborate observations and conclusions.
- 6) Evaluation is often viewed negatively--either as a threat or as a waste of time. To combat this image and obtain necessary cooperation, all concerned parties need to be involved in the evaluation as much as possible.
- 7) It is necessary to provide some degree of training with persons who will be involved in the evaluation.
- 8) BORN FREE teams will have very limited time to formally evaluate their implementation activities. Their evaluation requirements should be minimal.

#### Operationalization of Conceptual Design

The conceptual design as portrayed by the listings of goals and assumptions relevant to the second-year change process evaluation represents the present conceptual design. There are differences between the first and second year's change process evaluation, both in conceptualization and in methodology. This is due in part to the differences in method and style of the change process evaluators but also to different evaluation needs which emerged as the Project was operationalized. Obviously, given the evolution of the conceptual design, its operationalization did not happen at one time, but occurred over a period of time (e.g., new evaluation activities were added during the year when former evaluation activities proved inadequate or when new evaluation needs emerged).

In order to collect change process evaluation data relevant to the goals previously listed, several evaluation procedures and

instruments were developed. These evaluation procedures and instruments included:

- 1) Site visits by the change process evaluator
- 2) Completion of "Monthly Site Reports" by Project consultants at collaborating sites
- 3) Completion of "Bi-monthly Progress Reports" by Project Director
- 4) Completion of "BORN FREE Quarterly Reports from Team Leaders" by field site team leaders
- 5) Completion of "Major BORN FREE Activity Reports" by field site team leaders
- 6) Bi-monthly site interviews by all Project evaluators
- 7) Completion of "Evaluation of Project Status" Questionnaire by field site team members at second quarter's all-Project meeting
- 8) Completion of "Workshop Evaluation Forms" by participants of BORN FREE workshops/in-services in collaborating sites
- 9) Completion of "Project Impact Questionnaires" by faculty/staff at collaborating sites
- 10) Completion of "Report on Administration of 'Project Impact Questionnaire'" by field site team leaders.

These various change process evaluation procedure instruments were introduced at different points in the second year. At the start of the second year, the primary procedures and instruments included in the initial design were the reports of the Project consultants and Director, and the site visits by the change process evaluator. However, it soon became apparent that additional procedures/instruments were needed, particularly those whereby more direct and complete evaluation data could be obtained from the BORN FREE teams at the institutions. Because of this need, BORN FREE team leaders were asked to complete and submit quarterly progress reports and also submit individual reports on specific



BORN FREE implementation activities. In addition to these reports, a standardized evaluation form was developed to obtain participant evaluations of BORN FREE workshops at the collaborating institutions. In the second quarter, the three Project evaluators initiated bi-monthly interviews with individual team members at assigned institutions. In an attempt to assess the status and commitment of all BORN FREE teams, a questionnaire was administered to the team members attending the second quarter all-Project meeting. The final evaluation procedure/instruments introduced were the Project Impact Questionnaire and the report describing its administration. This questionnaire was administered during May to faculty/staff in 12 of the 14 institutions to determine the Project's impact and faculty/staff support for Project continuation. A specific individual on each BORN FREE team (usually the BORN FREE team leader) had responsibility for administering this questionnaire and for completing the related report.

It should be obvious from the above outline of the various procedures and instruments used that many persons besides the change process evaluator have been involved with the change process evaluation--the Project Director, consultants, all three evaluators, and many individual BORN FREE team members in the collaborating institutions. Many efforts were made to assist these persons in their evaluation efforts (e.g., extensive guidelines for completing reports, several telephone calls to clarify any questions or concerns). Not only were others involved with the data collection portion of the change process evaluation, but many persons were

involved with instrument development. Pilot versions of nearly all reports and questionnaires were sent to users for their reactions and suggested revisions. While most of the change process evaluation procedures/instruments were developed by the change process evaluator, the "Team Leader's Quarterly Progress Report" was developed by the Project Director to whom the reports were sent; the "Workshop Evaluation Form" was developed by the third Project evaluator who also developed several product evaluation forms; and the "Evaluation of Project Status" and the Local Institute Follow-up questionnaire were developed by the product evaluator.

### III. Methodologies for Second-Year Change Process Evaluation

In this section, the methodologies used for data collection and data analysis are separately discussed. Within the discussion of data collection methodologies, each of the various data collection instruments is described. Within the description of data analysis methodologies, the various data analysis procedures used to analyze the data from the evaluation instruments are presented.

#### Data Collection Methodology

In the preceding section, the various change process evaluation procedures and instruments were briefly identified in attempting to portray the operationalization of the conceptual design for the second year's change process evaluation. Here each of the several change process evaluation instruments used in the second year will be described, covering its purpose, format or contents, and administration. The instruments are described in the same order in which they were introduced during the second year. A copy of each instrument is provided in Appendix D. Certain instruments have accompanying guidelines which are also included in Appendix D. These guidelines address not only the use or completion of these instruments, but also discuss the purposes of these instruments and, thus, are useful supplements to the descriptions below.

Consultant's Monthly Site Report. This report was completed monthly on each collaborating site by the three Project consultants working directly with the BORN FREE teams. (Project consultants were assigned specific sites by developmental levels, i.e., there

was an elementary, secondary, and postsecondary consultant.) The consultants' reports were intended as the primary data source for documenting implementation activities and identifying influential change process variables at the BORN FREE sites. A copy of this report is provided in Appendix D. This report intentionally uses a semistructured format so that rather than listing specific questions of concern, five broad headings or general areas of concern are identified, e.g., external system changes or events affecting Project implementation. An additional section is provided for other observations and comments. In order to implement this "semistructured" report form, a comprehensive set of guidelines was developed and is included in Appendix D. These guidelines not only explained the purpose of the reports and how to complete them, but also included suggestions for improving the validity and objectivity of the consultants' observations and conclusions. After some initial pilot testing and revision, this report format was used from October, 1977 to May, 1978. The reports were usually submitted during the first week of the following month. During the third quarter of the Project in which the Project consultants reduced their consultant activities and became involved with training packet revision, one report covering the months of April and May was submitted in place of two monthly reports.

Project Director's Monthly (Bi-monthly) Report. This report was completed by the Project Director on a bi-monthly basis (originally monthly, but later modified). The purpose was to obtain her perceptions and frame of reference regarding the Project



implementation status across all collaborating institutions. A copy of this form is provided in Appendix D. The format of the Project Director's observations is identical to the format of the consultant's report except that this one concerns overall sites, rather than a particular site. Its identical format made the guidelines for the consultant's reports also applicable for the Project Director's report. This form was used from October, 1977 to May, 1978, and was submitted at the Director's convenience. It proved to be a very valuable data source since she sometimes had access to information not available to other sources.

BORN FREE Quarterly Report from team leaders. This report was completed by field site team leaders and submitted directly to the Project Director with copies provided to the change process evaluator. The purpose of the report was to obtain a brief progress update on each institution. A copy of this form is provided in Appendix D. The reports consist of nine open-ended questions concerning specific aspects of a team's progress during the quarter (e.g., "What are the most significant activities or accomplishments of your team this quarter?"). The reports were used for the first and second quarters, but were not sent out for the third quarter, as team leaders were to submit Continuation Plans instead. A limitation of the usefulness of this data source is that only approximately two-thirds of the team leaders completed reports for both quarters.

Report of Major BORN FREE Activity. This report was completed by field site team leaders for each major BORN FREE implementation

activity occurring at their sites. The purpose was to obtain detailed information on each major implementation activity occurring in the collaborating institutions. A copy of this form is provided in Appendix D along with a set of guidelines. It is much more structured than the other change process evaluation reports to ensure that certain descriptive and evaluative information would be available on all BORN FREE implementation activities. Specific questions were listed for each of the following: the activity's target audience and actual participants, its goals and purposes, its implementation, and its evaluation. These reports were initiated in January, 1978, and were intended to replace consultants' earlier activity reports which had no standardized format. While these new reports did provide additional needed data describing the implementation activities, reports were received for only some of the major implementation activities, specifically only the BORN FREE workshops. Also many of the received reports lacked the specificity which was hoped for, particularly concerning the impact of the activities.

Workshop Evaluation Form. This evaluation form was completed by participants of BORN FREE workshops/in-services conducted both within and outside the collaborating sites. This form was intended as an "all-purpose" form, i.e., it could be used for a variety of BORN FREE workshops. A copy of this form is provided in Appendix D. The form consists primarily of Likert-scale items which address specific workshop characteristics and activities, and the workshop's impact on the participants; two open-ended questions are listed to identify the positive and negative aspects of the

workshop. In addition, certain background information on the participant is requested. This form was introduced in January, 1978, and continued in use throughout the year. While a few sites used this evaluation form, many other sites used their own evaluation instruments or none at all. Thus, the data from this form have had only minimal use for purposes of the change process evaluation and are not included in this report (see Warsett, 1978).

"Evaluation of Project Status" Questionnaire. This questionnaire was completed by all field site team members present at the second quarter's all-Project staff meeting on February 16, 1978. It was intended primarily as a means for setting expectations for third quarter implementation and next year's involvement. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix D. The questionnaire consists of six open-ended questions concerning the team member's personal commitment to BORN FREE, both personal and institutional facilitators and inhibitors affecting their involvement and efforts related to BORN FREE. One question addresses the outcomes of the all-Project meeting.

Evaluator's Site Interview Report. This report was used in conjunction with the bi-monthly interviews conducted by the three Project evaluators with individual team members at the collaborating sites. The purpose of this report was to supplement and corroborate the data from the consultant's and Project Director's reports. This report also served as an indirect means of structuring the site interviews in lieu of any formal interview protocol. A copy of this report is provided in Appendix D along with a set of guidelines. Besides explaining the purposes of the interviews and

reports, and the completion of the reports, these guidelines provided suggestions for preparing for and conducting the interviews (e.g., using consultant's report and other data sources for generating specific interview questions). This report uses essentially the same format as that of the consultant's and Project Director's summaries. The only difference between this report and the two earlier ones are (1) additional information is requested about the interview itself and (2) the wording of the five general headings differs slightly for the purpose of clarification. The site interviews and subsequent reports were initiated in February, 1978, and continued through May, 1978, resulting in two interviews being held at each of the 14 sites. These interview reports proved to be a critical data source proving that direct sources can provide considerably more data than secondary sources.

Project Impact Questionnaire. This questionnaire was completed by faculty/staff at 12 of the 14 collaborating sites. (Unrelated internal site problems prevented administering the questionnaire at two sites.) The purposes of the questionnaire were to measure the Project's impact at collaborating sites and also measure faculty/staff support for BORN FREE continuation or institutionalization. A copy of this questionnaire is provided in Appendix D along with a sample cover letter for possible use with it. The questionnaire consisted of 11 closed-ended (yes/no/unsure) questions concerning individual faculty/staff attitudes regarding sex-role stereotyping; awareness of and involvement with BORN FREE; attitudes and/or behavior changes resulting



from BORN FREE, etc. Space was provided below certain questions for listing specific examples of Project impact and was also provided for writing general comments about BORN FREE. After initial revisions based on comments of team members, the questionnaires were sent to BORN FREE teams in the last week of April. The field site teams administered the questionnaires to the target faculty/staff during the month of May. (The size of the target audience varied between sites, particularly at the postsecondary/higher education level.) While no attempt was made to standardize questionnaire administration at the sites, nor even thought appropriate because of the unique circumstances of each site, a minimum questionnaire response rate of 90% was requested at each site. At the sites with relatively larger target audiences ( $N > 100$ ), randomized sampling procedures were employed rather than attempting to administer questionnaires to all faculty/staff in the target audience. To assist the sites in achieving this minimum, the questionnaires were printed with code numbers which would allow teams to identify non-respondents for follow-up purposes.

Report on administration of Project Impact Questionnaire. The report was completed by the field site team member contacted by the change process evaluator to oversee the administration of the Project Impact Questionnaire in his/her institution. In most cases, this person was the BORN FREE team leader. A copy of this report is provided in Appendix D. The report contains a list of ten specific questions concerning the questionnaire's administration. These reports were to be completed immediately after administering

the questionnaires and submitted with the returns. Nine reports were submitted as requested, while the remaining three were completed over the phone.

#### Data Analysis Methodology

In the first year, no quantitative analyses were attempted nor were they thought to be even appropriate, since it was felt that case studies would be a more appropriate vehicle for examining the change process occurring at the collaborating sites. However, in the second year, perhaps as a result of the new change process evaluator, quantitative methods of analysis were added to the qualitative methods of data analysis previously used. Both the qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis used in the second year are described below. For purposes of clarification, qualitative analysis refers to the analysis of differences in kind, i.e., determining whether or not a characteristic or variable is present; quantitative analysis refers to the analysis of differences in degree of quantity, i.e., the degree or quantity of a variable. Each of these two different methods of data analyses employed in the second year is described below.

Qualitative data analysis. Qualitative data analysis still played a dominant role in the second-year change process evaluation because most of the change process evaluation data generated through the various reports and interviews were qualitative data. The qualitative data analysis was concerned mainly with identifying what implementation activities occurred at the sites as well as the various change process variables operating at these institutions. The change process variables included Project characteristics,

14

institutional characteristics, team characteristics, and implementation characteristics. The data concerning the activities and change process variables were reviewed and analyzed by the change process evaluator as data became available. In instances where available data were unclear or perhaps in conflict with other data, the change process evaluator went back to the original data sources. A severe limitation of the qualitative data analysis was that the data analyzed and even the analysis procedure itself were highly subjective in nature. While efforts were made to increase the objectivity of data and their analysis (e.g., the standardization of reports, corroboration of data through several sources, one person using identical procedures for analyzing data for each site), this limitation still remains.

Quantitative data analysis. Midway through the second year, it was decided that certain quantitative data collection and analysis methods would be an interesting and valuable addition to the study of change process, and would provide more useful information on the impact of BORN FREE across the sites. Secondly, while certain change process variables had been identified as present at various sites, the effects and relationships between these variables were still quite unclear and it seemed unlikely that qualitative methods could unconfound the different interactions of the change process variables across the different sites. The various quantitative analyses were performed on the D.C. Cyber 74 counter system at the University of Minnesota using data analysis procedures in SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). SPSS statistical analyses used included: Frequencies, Crosstabs,

Breakdown, T-test, Anova, Ancova, Oneway, Pearson Corr, Partial Corr, and Regression.

To meet the information needs regarding the impact of BORN FREE implementation activities occurring at each site, the Project Impact Questionnaire, previously discussed, was developed and implemented. A limitation of the analysis of Project impact is that this questionnaire used to measure Project impact was not administered at two sites because of internal problems. There was a strike at one site, Oak Creek Vo-Tech, and lack of district permission prevented questionnaire administration at Bellevue Senior High in Jackson School District. Several computer analyses were conducted with these data by the change process evaluator. Originally, since the questionnaire data were in the form of categorical responses (Yes, No, and Unsure), only categorical (qualitative) data analyses were performed. However, it was later decided to recode the categorical data as ratings on an "agreement" continuum (No=4, Unsure=5, Yes=6), so that additional quantitative analyses could be performed, such as t-tests and analysis of variance, which could be used in examining for differences in questionnaire responses between sites and particular groups of individuals. Another reason for the data transformation was that it would simplify data interpretation and reduce the number of required tables.

As indicated earlier, while qualitative methods were helpful in identifying which change process variables were present at each collaborating site, these methods of analysis were not able to isolate the independent effects or relationships between these variables; i.e., qualitative methods were successful in identifying,



but not describing these change process variables. Having tentatively identified various change process variables operating at one or more sites, the change process evaluator together with the Project consultants rated the quantity or degree of each change process variable at each of the 14 sites. An initial attempt at rating the change process variables occurred at the end of the second quarter of the Project at which time approximately 15 change process variables had been identified. A second attempt at rating these change process variables was made in July, 1978, using a revised list of 60+ change process variables and a more standardized rating system. (A reliability check of this second rating system in which four sites were blindly re-rated two weeks after the initial ratings, showed very high consistency of ratings.) Most of the variables were rated on a 5-point continuum where a 5 rating meant greatest or highest degree, and a 1 rating meant lowest. There were, however, several dichotomies (Yes/No) variables where a "Yes" was coded as 1. "Monthly consultant hours with site" was the only change process variable with an open range. The 60+ change process variables were later reduced by the change process evaluator to 51 variables by eliminating those variables on which there was little or no variation between sites.

Several computer analyses were planned and attempted with these change process variable ratings for each site; however, due to the problem of severe multicollinearity between the change process variables, only simple correlation analyses were successfully performed. The planned partial correlation and regression analyses failed because of the multicollinearity problem. Without going into

detail, the regression analysis was to be the primary analysis on change process, and was modeled, to a degree, after the regression analyses (actually path analyses) used in the Rand study cited in the previous section. Several regression equations were to be constructed in which the change process variables served as the predictor or independent variables. The responses to certain "impact" questions on the Project Impact Questionnaire were to be used as the criterion or dependent variable in each equation (another reason why the categorical responses were transformed). It was hoped that, by examining these regression equations, one would be able to identify which change process variables were most influential concerning each of the different types of impact.

A few final comments about the quantitative data analyses might be helpful. The quantitative data analysis concerning the change process variables, obviously, met with less than anticipated success. In one sense, its failure was justified: the quality of the data on change process variables probably did not justify the sophisticated data analyses attempted. Given the extremely limited time available for conducting the change process evaluation, perhaps qualitative methods would have been better employed to study the change process even though these methods are likely to lead to oversimplification.

#### IV. Summary and Analysis of Second-Year Change Process Evaluation Data

In this section various second-year change process evaluation data are presented and discussed. The data presented include: (1) a listing of the second-year BORN FREE implementation activities at each of the 14 collaborating sites; (2) results of various analyses of the Project Impact Questionnaire data; and (3) a listing and description of the 51 change process variables measured at the sites. Additional change process evaluation data referred to but not discussed in this section are provided in Appendix E.

##### Second Year BORN FREE Implementation Activities

During the second year, numerous BORN FREE implementation activities occurred at nearly all of the 14 sites. Bellevue Senior High School was the only site where very little implementation activity occurred. While at two sites the actual implementation activities closely followed the implementation activities planned at the preceding summer BORN FREE Training Institute, most team's actual implementation activities bore little resemblance to the planned implementation activities. This development hindered the initial attempt to assess teams' implementation progress by comparing their accomplishments with their implementation plans. At most sites, the bulk of the implementation activities occurred in the first six months; however, several sites did implement major activities in the third quarter.

In Table 1, the various second-year implementation activities or accomplishments are listed for each site, starting with

elementary level sites. This listing of 66 implementation activities shows quite clearly that numerous activities did occur during the second year. The range of activities across the sites was enormous. The most frequent or common activities were presentations about BORN FREE with faculty/staff, parents, and community groups. At most sites, special BORN FREE workshops/in-services were held with faculty/staff (some of these were voluntary while others were mandatory.) In addition to these BORN FREE faculty/staff in-services, several teams worked directly with students in special workshops and in their regular teaching or counseling activities. Nearly all teams attempted to achieve some form of permanent incorporation of BORN FREE into their institutions through curricular development or revision, changes in advising or counseling process, and incorporating BORN FREE philosophy into the institution's statement of mission and goals. Three of the postsecondary teams worked to change their institution's publicity brochures and catalogs to eliminate sex-role stereotyping and sexist language.

#### Impact of BORN FREE Implementation Activities

In addition to identifying what implementation activities occurred at the various collaborating sites, another goal of the second-year change process evaluation was to measure the impact of these implementation activities occurring at the sites and the changes for BORN FREE continuation. To meet this second



Table 1

Listing of Second Year (1978-79 School Year) BORN FREE Implementation Activities/Accomplishments at Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)

| Level       | Site      | BORN FREE Implementation Activity/Accomplishment                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Elementary  | Carson    | <p>Team conducted a BORN FREE presentation at an all-faculty inservice in the fall.</p> <p>Team conducted a series of three half-day voluntary workshops with third to sixth grade teachers wanting to use/adapt BORN FREE materials in their classes.</p> <p>Team developed BORN FREE classroom packets for each grade level - kindergarten to sixth grade.</p> <p>After reviewing curriculum materials sent to school, team wrote letter to publisher concerning the blatant sex-role stereotyping within the curriculum materials.</p>                                                               |
|             | Norwood   | <p>Team conducted a BORN FREE presentation at an all-faculty inservice in the fall.</p> <p>Team conducted a special half-day BORN FREE inservice for all faculty.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|             | Glenwood  | <p>Team conducted a BORN FREE presentation at an all-faculty inservice in the fall.</p> <p>Team incorporated BORN FREE goals to the school's overall goals and priorities for the year.</p> <p>Team conducted a series of four voluntary BORN FREE break-fast/workshops with faculty interested in using BORN FREE materials in their classes. The fourth workshop focused on faculty examining their own values, attitudes, and behaviors related to sex-role stereotyping.</p> <p>Individual team members revised districtwide elementary guidance curriculum to incorporate BORN FREE materials.</p> |
| Junior High | Middleton | <p>Team conducted a BORN FREE presentation at an all-faculty inservice in the fall.</p> <p>Team set up a BORN FREE booth at the school's open house.</p> <p>Team conducted a BORN FREE night for parents interested in the Project.</p> <p>Team conducted an all-day voluntary BORN FREE workshop for faculty and parents in the district interested in examining their values, attitudes, and behaviors related to sex-role stereotyping</p>                                                                                                                                                           |

Table 1 (continued)

Listing of Second Year (1978-79 School Year) BORN FREE Implementation Activities/Accomplishments at Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)

| Level                 | BORN FREE Implementation Activity/Accomplishment .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Junior High           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Middleton (continued) | <p>As a follow-up to the all-day workshop, the team conducted a series of four voluntary after school workshops with faculty and parents interested in further experiencing BORN FREE materials and in designing action plans through which they could reduce the sex-role stereotyping behaviors of themselves and others within their settings.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Linden                | <p>Team conducted a special BORN FREE inservice with all faculty.</p> <p>Team conducted a BORN FREE faculty/student field trip to a local postsecondary vocational school.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Valley View           | <p>Team conducted a BORN FREE presentation at an all-faculty inservice in the fall.</p> <p>Team conducted a BORN FREE presentation with the Community Advisory Council, a parent organization.</p> <p>Team conducted an all-day BORN FREE workshop with members of the student council.</p> <p>Team collaborated with Central Senior High team in conducting a special half-day BORN FREE workshop with faculties from both schools.</p> <p>Individual team members field tested BORN FREE materials with groups of students, faculty, and parents.</p> <p>One individual team member conducted a BORN FREE presentation at a districtwide inservice for all elementary faculties.</p> |
| Senior High           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Morningside           | <p>Team sponsored a BORN FREE luncheon to all faculty.</p> <p>Individual team members conducted two BORN FREE presentations at districtwide departmental meetings - science and social studies departments.</p> <p>Individual team members conducted BORN FREE workshops at a "Positive Parenting" conference open to the public. (To publicize the workshops, a team member, along with a secondary consultant, did an interview on a local TV talk show).</p> <p>Team played a major role in planning and conducting a "Growing Up Female" conference open to all girls and female faculty.</p>                                                                                      |

Table 1 (continued)

Listing of Second Year (1978-79 School Year) BORN FREE Implementation Activities/Accomplishments at Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)

| Level                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site                    | BORN FREE Implementation Activity/Accomplishment                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Senior High             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Morningside (continued) | Team worked with other two senior high teams to develop BORN FREE curriculum packets for faculty use with students.<br>(While progress was made, no finished packets were produced).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Bellevue                | Team worked with other two senior high teams to develop BORN FREE curriculum packets for faculty use with students.<br>(While progress was made, no finished packets were produced).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Central                 | Team collaborated with Valley View Junior High team in conducting a special half-day BORN FREE workshop with faculties from both schools.<br><br>Team worked with principal in an effort to integrate BORN FREE concerns into the school's advising/scheduling process.<br><br>Individual team members used BORN FREE materials with their students.<br><br>One individual team member led the revision of the district-wide social studies curriculum. BORN FREE materials were incorporated into the new curriculum.<br><br>Team worked with other two senior high teams to develop BORN FREE curriculum packets for faculty use with students.<br>(While progress was made, no finished packets were produced). |
| Postsecondary           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Parkside College        | Team conducted a BORN FREE presentation at an inservice for the college's counseling/student services staff.<br><br>Team conducted a BORN FREE presentation at the annual conference of the American Lutheran College Deans held at the college.<br><br>Individual team member incorporated BORN FREE materials and activities into the college's "Men's and Women's Awareness Week" program for which she was responsible.<br><br>Team used BORN FREE materials in the training of resident level counselors.<br><br>Team sponsored a series of BORN FREE discussion groups with interested female faculty.                                                                                                       |

Table 1 (continued)

Listing of Second Year (1978-79 School Year) BORN FREE Implementation Activities/Accomplishments at Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)

| Level                        | BORN FREE Implementation Activity/Accomplishment                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Postsecondary                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Parkside College (continued) | <p>Team established a task force of individual faculty members interested in cooperating with BORN FREE. The team and task force have identified and prioritized BORN FREE activities to take place in the 1978-79 school year. The primary placed activity is an all-faculty BORN FREE inservice to take place in the fall.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Midwestern University        | <p>Team conducted a BORN FREE presentation with student personnel administrative staff.</p> <p>Individual team members field tested BORN FREE materials with each team member's staff.</p> <p>One individual team member conducted a series of five BORN FREE bag lunch discussions with interested student personnel staff.</p> <p>Team co-sponsored a new seminar series entitled "Women In Business."</p> <p>Team conducted a special half-day BORN FREE inservice with coordinators of undergraduate advising offices.</p> <p>Team contacted several University department heads to offer assistance and solicit support for BORN FREE. As a result of these contacts, two departments have actively cooperated with teams in field testing BORN FREE materials.</p>                                       |
| West City Community College  | <p>Team had major responsibility for planning and conducting the college's yearly all-faculty inservice. BORN FREE materials were used extensively in inservice.</p> <p>While not originally a planned implementation activity, the team was instrumental in eliminating sexist language and sex-role stereotyping examples from the college catalog.</p> <p>Team conducted a series of BORN FREE discussion groups for interested faculty and students.</p> <p>Individual team member incorporated considerable BORN FREE materials and concerns into the creation of an orientation guide for new students.</p> <p>Individual team members have started an ongoing support group for female faculty.</p> <p>Individual team members succeeded in getting funds for a career clinic for "re-entry women."</p> |



Table 1 (continued)

Listing of Second Year (1978-79 School Year) BORN FREE Implementation Activities/Accomplishments at Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)

| Level                                         | Site | BORN FREE Implementation Activity/Accomplishment                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Postsecondary                                 |      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| West City<br>Community<br>College (continued) |      | Individual team members developed a proposal for a day care center for college faculty, staff, and students.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Northtown<br>Community<br>College             |      | <p>Team conducted a BORN FREE presentation at an all-faculty inservice in the fall.</p> <p>Two individual team members adapted BORN FREE materials for use in a student retreat.</p> <p>Team combined with the college's Task Force on Sex-Role Stereotyping to plan BORN FREE activities in the second year (The task force was created in the previous year as a result of the Project and should continue as an ongoing task force).</p> <p>Team and task force were instrumental in eliminating sexist language and sex-role stereotyping in the college catalog.</p> <p>Team and task force were successful in having the college's formal mission statement revised to better reflect the BORN FREE philosophy.</p> <p>Team and task force initiated a series of feature articles in the college's student newspaper on persons in nontraditional careers.</p> <p>Team and task force have revised a slide tape show developed in the previous year which was to be used in student orientation and as a publicity device to be disseminated to local high schools. The new slide tape show will stress the variety of programs and career options available to both males and females - showing males and females in nontraditional programs.</p> |
| Oak Creek<br>Vocational/<br>Technical         |      | <p>Team conducted a BORN FREE presentation/social for interested faculty and staff.</p> <p>Team achieved "task force" status which legitimized the BORN FREE activities and increased chances of BORN FREE continuing as an ongoing effort of the Institute.</p> <p>Two individual team members conducted a local radio interview discussing the purpose of BORN FREE and the Institute's involvement with the Project.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |

Table 1 (continued)

Listing of Second Year (1978-79 School Year) BORN FREE Implementation Activities/Accomplishments at Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)

| Level<br>Site                         | BORN FREE Implementation Activity/Accomplishment                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Postsecondary                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Oak Creek<br>Vocational/<br>Technical | <p>Team has attempted to eliminate sexist language and sex-role stereotyping from the Institute's catalog and publicity brochures.</p> <p>Team worked with curriculum department in developing new non-sexist curriculum materials and in revising old materials where appropriate.</p> <p>Two individual team members conducted a BORN FREE presentation with the Institute's counseling staff.</p> |

Note. This listing includes only activities that were actually completed during the 1977-78 school year and the subsequent summer months. Activities planned but not actually implemented during this time are not included. Because all site teams received and used Project funds to purchase BORN FREE relevant classroom materials (curriculum, books, films, games, etc.), this common activity is not listed in order to reduce redundancy and table length.

need, the Project Impact Questionnaire was developed and administered to faculty/staff at collaborating sites. This questionnaire consisted of 11 closed-ended questions concerning individual faculty/staff attitudes regarding sex-role stereotyping, awareness of and involvement with BORN FREE, attitudes and behavior changes resulting from BORN FREE, etc. (See Appendix D for a copy of this questionnaire.)

Several data tables have been generated with the analyses of the questionnaire data. Because of space and time limitations, only some of the data tables can be discussed in this section; the other tables not discussed are provided in Appendix E. These tables include: tables presenting the questionnaire responses (in percentages) for each site; tables presenting the questionnaire responses (in percentages) for various groups of individuals (team members, males, females, teachers, counselors, administrators); tables presenting a breakdown of questionnaire respondents at each site by status (team member or not), sex and major occupational positions; a table showing the correlations between items on the questionnaire; and, finally, a table presenting a random sample of written comments given by respondents at each site.

Before proceeding to the description of the tables presented here, the several limitations of the data must be acknowledged.

First, questionnaire data were collected at only 12 of the 14 collaborating sites. Due to unrelated internal problems cited earlier, the questionnaire could not be administered at Bellevue Senior High and Oak Creek Vo-Tech. On the basis of the number of

implementation activities at these two sites, it is likely that had the questionnaire been administered at these two sites, the results would have shown minimal, if any, project impact at Bellevue Senior High and only modest project impact at Oak Creek Vo-Tech. Because of these missing data, it is likely that the overall (all sites) estimate of project impact and continuation support is slightly overestimated, i.e., it would be somewhat lower if these sites' data had been included. Previously planned comparisons between sites at different developmental levels were not made because of the missing data at the secondary (Senior High) and postsecondary levels.

A second limitation concerns substantial differences between sites in the administration of the questionnaire. Each site, with assistance and suggestions by the change process evaluator, developed its own questionnaire administration plan. These plans varied, with several teams putting questionnaires with cover letters in faculty mail boxes, other teams passing out questionnaires at faculty/staff meetings, and still other teams individually passing out questionnaires. The differences in administration method may affect the comparability of questionnaire responses between sites since each method entails its own type of bias.

Another factor affecting comparability of questionnaire responses between sites is that questionnaires were administered not to all faculty/staff (or a random sample of all faculty/staff), but rather to the target audience, i.e., only the faculty and/or staff whom the team was trying to affect. The size and scope



of target audiences varied considerably between sites, particularly at the postsecondary level. In the majority of sites, the target audience included all full-time professional faculty, but did not include part-time staff and/or classified clerical staff. There were, however, exceptions to this, with a few sites including all faculty and staff in their target audiences, while at two sites (Parkside College and Midwestern University) only certain portions of their full-time professional faculty were included in the target audience.

Another possible limitation relates to the size of each site's target audience. At most sites the target audience's size was relatively small (75 and under) and the questionnaires were given to all persons in the target audience. At the four sites where the target audiences were relatively large (100 and over), the questionnaires were given to a random sample of the target audience. While these latter sites were instructed on selecting a random sample, there were no efforts made to check the representativeness of these samples. Depending on how representative the random samples are, the questionnaire data may or may not accurately reflect the time impact and continuation support at these four sites.

A final and probably the most important limitation concerns response rates of questionnaires. Each site was requested to obtain a 90% questionnaire response as minimal. It was because of this requirement that the change process evaluator suggested random sampling at sites with large target audiences. To assist sites in obtaining this response rate, code numbers were printed

Table 2  
Project Impact Questionnaire Response Rates  
for Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)

| for Each Site (Sites Grouped by Level) |                                                |                             |                             |                       |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Level                                  | Number of Faculty/Staff                        |                             |                             |                       |
| Site                                   | Response Rate <sup>b</sup><br>(In Percentages) | Returning<br>Questionnaires | Receiving<br>Questionnaires | In Target<br>Audience |
| Elementary                             |                                                |                             |                             |                       |
| Carson                                 | 75.0                                           | 18                          | 24                          | 24                    |
| Norwood                                | 34.0                                           | 17                          | 50 <sup>c</sup>             | 100 <sup>c</sup>      |
| Glenwood                               | 92.6                                           | 25                          | 27                          | 27                    |
| Junior High                            |                                                |                             |                             |                       |
| Middleton                              | 96.5                                           | 55                          | 57 <sup>c</sup>             | 57 <sup>c</sup>       |
| Linden                                 | 100.0                                          | 38                          | 38                          | 38                    |
| Valley View                            | 80.6                                           | 50                          | 62                          | 62                    |
| Senior High                            |                                                |                             |                             |                       |
| Morningside                            | 40.0                                           | 30                          | 75 <sup>c</sup>             | 200 <sup>c</sup>      |
| Bellevue <sup>a</sup>                  | NA                                             | NA                          | NA                          | NA                    |
| Central                                | 91.7                                           | 66                          | 72                          | 72                    |
| Postsecondary                          |                                                |                             |                             |                       |
| Parkside College                       | 79.2                                           | 19                          | 24                          | 24 <sup>d</sup>       |
| Midwestern<br>University               | 68.3                                           | 41                          | 60                          | 60 <sup>d</sup>       |
| West City<br>Community College         | 69.0                                           | 69                          | 100                         | 180                   |
| Northtown<br>Community College         | 38.3                                           | 23                          | 60                          | 290                   |
| Oak Creek Vo.Tech. <sup>a</sup>        | NA                                             | NA                          | NA                          | NA                    |
| Overall                                | 69.5                                           | 451                         | 649                         | 1,134 <sup>e</sup>    |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>Questionnaire not administered (NA) at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech.

<sup>b</sup>Response rates calculated by the formula:  $\frac{\text{faculty/staff returning questionnaire}}{\text{faculty/staff receiving questionnaire}}$

<sup>c</sup>These reported numbers are only rough estimates collected some time (as much as 2 1/2 months) after the questionnaires were administered.

<sup>d</sup>Target audiences were unspecified, so number of faculty/staff receiving questionnaires are used as estimates of target audiences.

onto each questionnaire which would assist teams to identify and follow-up on questionnaire nonrespondents. Despite the request and forms of assistance, only a few sites were able to achieve the 90% response rate. On the previous page, Table 2 shows the questionnaire responses at each site as well as the number of faculty/staff in each site's target audience and the number of faculty/staff receiving and returning the questionnaire at each site. The overall questionnaire response rate was 69.5%, with the highest response rate (100%) at Linden Junior high and the lowest response rate (34.0%) at Norwood Elementary. Four sites were able to meet or exceed the requested 90% response rate while 3 sites had extremely low response rates which may seriously jeopardize the generalizability of the questionnaire responses to the entire target audience at these sites. With the possible exception of these three sites, the questionnaire response rates at the sites are probably acceptable so that analyses can be performed. However, in light of these lower than expected response rates, caution must be exercised in drawing conclusions on the basis of these questionnaire data.

#### Description of Tables

Immediately following are various data tables presenting the results of analyses conducted with the questionnaire data. Each table will be briefly described, noting any important or surprising results. While the questionnaire was completed by team members at several sites, most of the data tables do not

include the response of team members, because the proportion and number of team members completing the questionnaire differed substantially between sites.

Table 3, on the following page, presents the total or aggregate questionnaire responses numbered over all sites. The percentages of faculty/staff responding "No," "Unsure," "Yes," and "Blank" (no response) are given for each question. Concerning the first two questions on attitudes regarding sex-role stereotyping, the majority of respondents answered affirmatively, but surprisingly, while 84% of the respondents replied that educational institutions should systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping, only 60% thought students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping. Concerning awareness of BORN FREE, 83% of the respondents indicated that they were aware. This indicates that teams were highly successful in raising faculty/staff awareness of the project. Concerning the level of faculty/staff involvement with BORN FREE, 69% of respondents across all sites had participated in BORN FREE activities, while 23% of responding faculty/staff indicated that they had assisted or cooperated with BORN FREE teams. On the question of attitude and behavior changes in themselves which resulted from the project, 51% indicated that they were now more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping, while 35% of the faculty/staff responded that they had reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors. Examination of written comments pertaining



Table 3  
Total (All Sites) Responses to Project  
Impact Questionnaire<sup>a</sup> (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>b</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 25.3                           | 12.3   | 60.2 | 2.1   |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 6.5                            | 9.1    | 83.5 | 0.9   |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 7.0                            | 7.0    | 82.8 | 3.3   |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 28.8                           | 1.4    | 68.6 | 1.2   |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 74.0                           | 2.3    | 23.0 | 0.7   |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 33.7                           | 11.2   | 50.7 | 4.4   |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 40.2                           | 18.4   | 35.1 | 6.3   |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 17.9                           | 63.7   | 13.5 | 4.9   |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 14.2                           | 70.9   | 10.0 | 4.9   |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 12.3                           | 62.1   | 20.2 | 5.3   |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 14.2                           | 21.9   | 60.5 | 3.5   |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup> Questionnaire was not administered at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech.

<sup>b</sup> N = 430 responses for each question.

to these questions showed that a "ceiling" effect was operating, in that many faculty/staff were already very aware before BORN FREE and that their sex-role stereotyping behaviors were already minimal. The examination of written comments also indicated that nearly all of the behavioral changes were language changes, though several faculty/staff indicated that their job-related behaviors (e.g., classroom behavior) had been greatly changed. Concerning the project's impact on other faculty, students and the institution's policies and procedures, the majority of the respondents were unsure. Only 16%, 10% and 20% of the responding faculty/staff indicated project impact on other faculty, students, and institution's policies and procedures respectively. Finally, concerning the project's continuation or institutionalization, 61% of the faculty/staff responded affirmatively that the project concerns and activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities. Only 14% of the faculty/staff, a small minority, did not want the project activities to be continued.

In Table 4, an attempt is made to estimate the number of faculty/staff affected in some way by BORN FREE across all sites (e.g., number aware of BORN FREE, number participating in BORN FREE activity, etc.). These estimated numbers were calculated by multiplying the "Yes" response percentages in Table 3 by the total target audience across all sites. Based on these calculations it is estimated that (1) approximately 909 of faculty/staff were made aware of BORN FREE; (2) approximately 753 faculty/staff have participated in BORN FREE activities in the 12 participating institutions which completed questionnaires;

Table 4

Estimated Number of Faculty/Staff Across  
All Sites Impacted Upon by Project BORN FREE

| Type of Impact                                                                                               | Number of<br>Faculty / Staff <sup>a</sup> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Made Aware of Project BORN FREE<br>(Question 3)                                                              | 909                                       |
| Was a participant in a BORN FREE activity/in-service<br>(Question 4)                                         | 753                                       |
| Assisted/cooperated with BORN FREE team<br>(Question 5)                                                      | 253                                       |
| Increased their awareness of need to open career<br>options and reduce sex-role stereotyping<br>(Question 6) | 557                                       |
| Reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors<br>(Question 7)                                                | 385                                       |

Note. Number of faculty/staff impacted is an underestimate since data on impact is missing for Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo. Tech.

<sup>a</sup>Estimates calculated by multiplying percentages of "yes" responses to questions 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 on Project Impact Questionnaire by total number of faculty/staff comprising target audience across sites (1,098 faculty/staff). (total target audience = 1,134 faculty/staff - 36 BORN FREE team members).

(3) approximately 253 faculty/staff across sites have assisted or cooperated with BORN FREE teams; (4) approximately 557 faculty/staff increased their awareness of need to open career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping; and finally (5) approximately 385 faculty/staff have reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors as a result of BORN FREE efforts in these sites.

Tables 5 to 8 shows the results of analyses for questionnaire response differences (mean differences) among sites at each of the developmental levels. For purposes of analysis, the secondary developmental level was divided into two separate levels, junior high and senior high. As indicated in the data analysis portion in the previous section on evaluation methodology, the original categorical responses were recorded and treated as ratings on an agreement continuum, with No=4, Unsure=5, and Yes=6, so that analyses could be performed and displayed.

Table 5 presents the results of an analysis for differences between "elementary level" sites for each question. While most of the site means were relatively high ( $\bar{x} > 5.00$ ) for all questions, there were significant site differences on 5 of the 11 questions, as indicated by an F-ratio significant at either the .05 or .01 level. The three elementary level sites differed on the first attitude question (whether or not students' career options are limited) but not on the second attitude question. On this first question, the least agreement was at Norwood ( $\bar{x} = 4.83$ ) while the highest was at Carson ( $\bar{x} = 6.00$ ).



Table 5

Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Elementary Sites on Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Site     | n  | Response <sup>a</sup> |     |         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----|-----------------------|-----|---------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                |          |    | Mean                  | SD  | F-ratio |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | Carson   | 15 | 5.00                  | 0   | 10.32** |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Norwood  | 18 | 4.83                  | .86 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Glenwood | 21 | 5.43                  | .87 |         |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | Carson   | 14 | 6.00                  | 0   | 2.00    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Norwood  | 18 | 5.78                  | .55 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Glenwood | 21 | 5.67                  | .58 |         |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | Carson   | 15 | 6.00                  | 0   | 1.00    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Norwood  | 18 | 5.94                  | .24 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Glenwood | 21 | 6.00                  | 0   |         |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | Carson   | 14 | 5.57                  | .85 | .32     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Norwood  | 18 | 5.78                  | .65 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Glenwood | 21 | 5.71                  | .72 |         |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | Carson   | 14 | 5.43                  | .94 | 8.20**  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Norwood  | 18 | 4.28                  | .67 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Glenwood | 21 | 5.19                  | .98 |         |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | Carson   | 15 | 6.00                  | 0   | 3.32*   |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Norwood  | 17 | 5.41                  | .87 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Glenwood | 21 | 5.52                  | .75 |         |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | Carson   | 15 | 5.73                  | .46 | 4.07*   |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Norwood  | 17 | 5.00                  | .79 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Glenwood | 21 | 5.14                  | .91 |         |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | Carson   | 15 | 5.33                  | .49 | 5.81**  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Norwood  | 18 | 5.00                  | .34 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Glenwood | 21 | 4.81                  | .51 |         |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | Carson   | 15 | 5.27                  | .46 | 1.40    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Norwood  | 18 | 5.06                  | .42 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Glenwood | 20 | 5.05                  | .39 |         |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | Carson   | 15 | 5.20                  | .56 | .47     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Norwood  | 18 | 5.11                  | .32 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Glenwood | 20 | 5.25                  | .44 |         |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as on-going, integrated concerns or activities?                                                    | Carson   | 14 | 5.93                  | .27 | 2.90    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Norwood  | 17 | 5.77                  | .56 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Glenwood | 20 | 5.45                  | .76 |         |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>In order to calculate F-ratios, categorical responses have been treated as ratings on an "agreement" continuum (No=4, Unsure=5, Yes=6).

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

\*\*  $p \leq .01$ .

While there were no significant differences on awareness and participation of faculty/staff among the three elementary level sites, there was a significant site difference on the level of assistance or cooperation of faculty/staff. The lowest level was at Norwood ( $\bar{x}=4.28$ ) while the highest was at Carson ( $\bar{x}=5.43$ ). There were also significant site differences on amount of attitude and behavior change by the respondents themselves and the faculty/staff as a whole at these elementary sites. For both attitude and behavior changes of the respondents themselves, Carson again had the highest levels ( $\bar{x}=6.00$ ,  $\bar{x}=5.73$ ), while Norwood again had the lowest levels ( $\bar{x}=5.41$ ,  $\bar{x}=5.00$ ). Concerning the project's effect on reducing the sex-role stereotyping behavior of faculty/staff as a whole, the lowest site was Glenwood ( $\bar{x}=4.81$ ) while the highest was Carson ( $\bar{x}=5.33$ ). There were no statistically significant site differences between elementary level sites concerning the project's impact on students and the institutional policies, or on the question of continuation on which all sites were very high.

Table 6 presents the results of an analysis of differences between the "junior high level" sites for each question on the questionnaire. From this table, one sees that there were statistically significant site differences, on 5 of the 11 questions. There were site differences on the second attitude question, but not the first attitude question. On this second question, the most positive response was at Linden ( $\bar{x}=5.81$ ) while the lowest was at Valley View ( $\bar{x}=5.45$ ). The three junior

Table 6

Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Junior High Sites on Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Site        | n  | Response <sup>a</sup> |     |         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----|-----------------------|-----|---------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                |             |    | Mean                  | SD  | F-ratio |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | Middleton   | 50 | 5.40                  | .83 | 2.97    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden      | 31 | 5.16                  | .90 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View | 47 | 4.96                  | .96 |         |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | Middleton   | 51 | 5.77                  | .59 | 3.67*   |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden      | 31 | 5.81                  | .60 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View | 47 | 5.45                  | .80 |         |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | Middleton   | 50 | 5.70                  | .62 | 3.60*   |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden      | 30 | 5.77                  | .50 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View | 48 | 5.96                  | .29 |         |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | Middleton   | 51 | 5.45                  | .88 | 2.67    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden      | 30 | 5.47                  | .90 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View | 48 | 5.79                  | .62 |         |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | Middleton   | 51 | 4.41                  | .80 | .63     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden      | 32 | 4.25                  | .62 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View | 48 | 4.44                  | .82 |         |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | Middleton   | 51 | 5.33                  | .89 | 1.85    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden      | 31 | 5.00                  | .89 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View | 46 | 5.04                  | .89 |         |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | Middleton   | 49 | 5.16                  | .94 | 1.82    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden      | 31 | 4.90                  | .83 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View | 48 | 4.83                  | .86 |         |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | Middleton   | 50 | 5.04                  | .57 | 6.01**  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden      | 31 | 5.16                  | .45 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View | 47 | 4.75                  | .61 |         |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | Middleton   | 51 | 5.10                  | .46 | 5.17**  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden      | 31 | 5.13                  | .50 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View | 48 | 4.83                  | .48 |         |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | Middleton   | 49 | 5.23                  | .55 | .71     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden      | 30 | 5.30                  | .54 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View | 47 | 5.15                  | .55 |         |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as on-going, integrated concerns or activities?                                                    | Middleton   | 51 | 5.51                  | .68 | 13.71** |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden      | 30 | 5.50                  | .68 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View | 47 | 4.79                  | .86 |         |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>In order to calculate F-ratios, categorical responses have been treated as ratings on an "agreement" continuum (No=4, Unsure=5, Yes=6).

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

\*\*  $p \leq .01$ .

high level sites also differed on level of awareness achieved at each site with the highest level at Valley View ( $\bar{x}=5.96$ ) and the lowest at Middleton ( $\bar{x}=5.70$ ). There were no significant differences between the junior high level sites' faculty/staff participation and assistance/cooperation nor on the levels of attitude and behavior change with questionnaire respondents, and institutional policy change. There were, however, significant site differences in impact on faculty/staff as a whole and on students, with Valley View having the least impact ( $\bar{x}=5.16$ ,  $\bar{x}=5.13$ ). Significant differences between the junior high level sites were also found on faculty/staff support for continuation. The highest support was at Middleton ( $\bar{x}=5.51$ ) while the lowest was at Valley View ( $\bar{x}=4.79$ ).

Table 7 presents the results of an analysis of differences between the "senior high level" sites for each question. As indicated in the footnote, data are missing on one senior high level site--Bellevue Senior High. Unlike the elementary and junior high level sites, there are few, only two, questions on which the two senior high level sites differed significantly. The first difference concerns the faculty/staff participation in BORN FREE activities; Central's faculty/staff had a much higher participation level ( $\bar{x}=5.65$ ) than was indicated at Morningside ( $\bar{x}=4.83$ ). The only other difference between the two sites was concerning the project impact on students. Its impact was much greater at Morningside ( $\bar{x}=5.07$ ) than at Central ( $\bar{x}=4.79$ ). These two differences clearly reflect the differences in implementation activities of these two sites as shown in Table 1



- 63 -  
Table 7

Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Senior High  
Sites on Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Site <sup>b</sup> | n  | Response <sup>a</sup> |      |         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----|-----------------------|------|---------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                |                   |    | Mean                  | SD   | F-ratio |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | Morningside       | 28 | 5.25                  | .89  | .03     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central           | 65 | 5.22                  | .93  |         |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | Morningside       | 29 | 5.86                  | .44  | .33     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central           | 65 | 5.80                  | .51  |         |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | Morningside       | 28 | 5.89                  | .32  | 2.42    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central           | 62 | 5.69                  | .64  |         |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | Morningside       | 29 | 4.83                  | 1.00 | 19.02** |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central           | 65 | 5.65                  | .76  |         |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | Morningside       | 29 | 4.45                  | .83  | 2.36    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central           | 66 | 4.21                  | .62  |         |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | Morningside       | 28 | 5.21                  | .92  | .08     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central           | 65 | 5.15                  | .97  |         |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | Morningside       | 27 | 4.93                  | .87  | 1.06    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central           | 64 | 4.72                  | .88  |         |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | Morningside       | 28 | 4.89                  | .63  | .15     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central           | 64 | 4.84                  | .54  |         |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | Morningside       | 28 | 5.07                  | .66  | 4.41*   |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central           | 63 | 4.79                  | .54  |         |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | Morningside       | 28 | 5.00                  | .54  | .42     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central           | 66 | 4.91                  | .65  |         |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as on-going, integrated concerns or activities?                                                    | Morningside       | 28 | 5.50                  | .75  | 1.59    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central           | 65 | 5.26                  | .87  |         |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>In order to calculate F-ratios, categorical responses have been treated as ratings on an "agreement" continuum (N=4, Unsure=5, Yes=6).

<sup>b</sup>Data are incomplete for senior high sites since questionnaire was not administered at Bellevue S.H.

\* $p \leq .05$ .

\*\* $p \leq .01$ .

Table 8 presents the results of an analysis of differences between the postsecondary level sites for each question. As indicated in the footnote, data are missing on one postsecondary level site--Oak Creek Vo-Tech. Five significant differences among the postsecondary level sites emerge. The first two differences regard awareness and participation of faculty/staff where Parkside College has the highest levels ( $\bar{x}=6.00$ ,  $\bar{x}=6.00$ ) and Northtown Community College has the lowest levels ( $\bar{x}=5.13$ ,  $\bar{x}=4.57$ ). The third difference concerns faculty/staff assistance and cooperation with BORN FREE where Parkside again had the highest level ( $\bar{x}=5.33$ ) while Midwestern had the lowest ( $\bar{x}=4.29$ ). The last two significant differences among the postsecondary level sites concern attitude and behavior change resulting from BORN FREE. Concerning changes in awareness of need to open career options and reduce stereotyping, West City Community College had the most impact ( $\bar{x}=5.30$ ) while Midwestern University had the least ( $\bar{x}=4.76$ ). Regarding behavioral change, West City Community College again had the most impact ( $\bar{x}=5.18$ ) while Northtown Community College had the least ( $\bar{x}=4.58$ ). These site differences must be interpreted carefully in light of the considerable differences in target audiences at these postsecondary sites (see Table 2).

Tables 9 to 11 show the results of analyses of questionnaire response differences between sites within each of the three school districts. These tables are intended for examining differences between sites within each given school district; however, one might also examine or interpret these tables as differences between

72

Table 8

Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Postsecondary Sites on Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire

| Question                                                                                                                                                                | Site <sup>b</sup>           | n  | Response <sup>a</sup> |      |         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----|-----------------------|------|---------|
|                                                                                                                                                                         |                             |    | Mean                  | SD   | F-ratio |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                          | Parkside College            | 16 | 5.88                  | .50  | 2.36    |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Midwestern University       | 42 | 5.74                  | .63  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | West City Community College | 64 | 5.47                  | .80  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Northtown Community College | 24 | 5.42                  | .88  |         |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                   | Parkside College            | 18 | 5.89                  | .47  | 2.04    |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Midwestern University       | 42 | 5.98                  | .15  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | West City Community College | 66 | 5.76                  | .56  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Northtown Community College | 24 | 5.83                  | .48  |         |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                | Parkside College            | 18 | 6.00                  | 0    | 8.07**  |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Midwestern University       | 37 | 5.81                  | .52  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | West City Community College | 66 | 5.76                  | .61  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Northtown Community College | 23 | 5.13                  | 1.01 |         |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                            | Parkside College            | 18 | 6.00                  | 0    | 18.06** |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Midwestern University       | 42 | 4.62                  | .94  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | West City Community College | 66 | 5.46                  | .88  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Northtown Community College | 23 | 4.57                  | .90  |         |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students) | Parkside College            | 18 | 5.33                  | .97  | 6.98**  |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Midwestern University       | 42 | 4.29                  | .71  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | West City Community College | 65 | 4.55                  | .88  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Northtown Community College | 23 | 4.39                  | .78  |         |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                            | Parkside College            | 17 | 4.94                  | .97  | 3.26*   |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Midwestern University       | 37 | 4.76                  | .93  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | West City Community College | 64 | 5.30                  | .92  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Northtown Community College | 19 | 4.79                  | .98  |         |

Table 8 (continued)

Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Postsecondary Sites on Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Site <sup>b</sup>           | n  | Response <sup>a</sup> |     |         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----|-----------------------|-----|---------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                |                             |    | Mean                  | SD  | F-ratio |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | Parkside College            | 16 | 4.81                  | .91 | 3.99**  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Midwestern University       | 35 | 4.63                  | .84 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | West City Community College | 61 | 5.18                  | .94 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Northtown Community College | 19 | 4.58                  | .77 |         |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | Parkside College            | 17 | 4.77                  | .56 | 1.71    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Midwestern University       | 37 | 4.95                  | .47 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | West City Community College | 62 | 5.10                  | .67 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Northtown Community College | 19 | 4.90                  | .57 |         |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | Parkside College            | 17 | 4.88                  | .60 | .43     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Midwestern University       | 37 | 4.89                  | .39 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | West City Community College | 61 | 4.93                  | .48 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Northtown Community College | 20 | 4.80                  | .41 |         |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | Parkside College            | 15 | 5.00                  | .76 | 2.34    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Midwestern University       | 37 | 4.81                  | .46 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | West City Community College | 63 | 5.11                  | .63 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Northtown Community College | 19 | 5.16                  | .60 |         |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | Parkside College            | 18 | 5.94                  | .24 | 1.57    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Midwestern University       | 40 | 5.73                  | .51 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | West City Community College | 64 | 5.66                  | .57 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Northtown Community College | 21 | 5.67                  | .48 |         |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>In order to calculate F-ratios, categorical responses have been treated as ratings on an "agreement" continuum (No=4, Unsure=5, Yes=6).

<sup>b</sup>Data are incomplete for postsecondary sites since questionnaire was not administered at Oak Creek Vo.Tech.

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

\*\*  $p \leq .01$ .



developmental levels nested within each school district.

Table 9 presents the results of an analysis of differences between sites within the Greenwood School District for each question. The analysis shows that there are significant site differences among the three Greenwood schools on 5 questions. The first site difference concerns the attitude of whether or not students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping. The most agreement was Carson Elementary ( $\bar{x}=6.00$ ) while the lowest was at Morningside ( $\bar{x}=5.25$ ). While there were no differences in level of faculty/staff awareness at the Greenwood sites, there were differences in both the levels of faculty/staff participation and assistance/cooperation. The highest levels for both of these was at Carson ( $\bar{x}=5.57$ ,  $\bar{x}=5.43$ ), while the lowest level of participation was at Morningside ( $\bar{x}=4.83$ ) and the lowest level of assistance/cooperation was Middleton ( $\bar{x}=4.41$ ). Differences also emerged among the three sites regarding both attitude and behavior changes in faculty/staff. In both regards, Carson had again the highest impact\* ( $\bar{x}=6.00$ ,  $\bar{x}=5.73$ ) and Morningside had the least ( $\bar{x}=5.21$ ,  $\bar{x}=4.93$ ). While no generalizations are possible, it is clear from these data, that, within the Greenwood School District, the elementary level site had consistently higher impact than the secondary level sites; however, the sizes of target audiences do differ considerably.

Table 10 presents the results of an analysis of differences between sites within the Jackson School District for each question. Data, however, are missing for Bellevue Senior High. Unlike the

---

\*It may be significant that the Project consultant was also a counseling intern at Carson.

Table 9

Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Sites Within  
Greenwood School District on Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Site              | n  | Response <sup>a</sup> |      |         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----|-----------------------|------|---------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                |                   |    | Mean                  | SD   | F-ratio |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | Carson Elementary | 15 | 6.00                  | 0    | 4.71 ** |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Middleton J.H.    | 50 | 5.40                  | .83  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Morningside S.H.  | 28 | 5.25                  | .89  |         |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | Carson Elementary | 14 | 6.00                  | 0    | 1.31    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Middleton J.H.    | 51 | 5.77                  | .59  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Morningside S.H.  | 29 | 5.86                  | .44  |         |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | Carson Elementary | 15 | 6.00                  | 0    | 2.84    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Middleton J.H.    | 50 | 5.70                  | .62  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Morningside S.H.  | 28 | 5.89                  | .32  |         |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institution? (e.g., workshops)                                                                    | Carson Elementary | 14 | 5.57                  | .85  | 5.14 ** |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Middleton J.H.    | 51 | 5.45                  | .88  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Morningside S.H.  | 29 | 4.83                  | 1.00 |         |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | Carson Elementary | 14 | 5.43                  | .94  | 8.69 ** |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Middleton J.H.    | 51 | 4.41                  | .80  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Morningside S.H.  | 29 | 4.45                  | .83  |         |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | Carson Elementary | 15 | 6.00                  | 0    | 4.83 ** |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Middleton J.H.    | 51 | 5.33                  | .89  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Morningside S.H.  | 28 | 5.21                  | .92  |         |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | Carson Elementary | 15 | 5.73                  | .46  | 4.26 *  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Middleton J.H.    | 49 | 5.16                  | .94  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Morningside S.H.  | 27 | 4.93                  | .87  |         |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | Carson Elementary | 15 | 5.33                  | .49  | 2.85    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Middleton J.H.    | 50 | 5.04                  | .57  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Morningside S.H.  | 28 | 4.89                  | .63  |         |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | Carson Elementary | 15 | 5.27                  | .46  | .74     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Middleton J.H.    | 51 | 5.10                  | .46  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Morningside S.H.  | 28 | 5.07                  | .66  |         |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | Carson Elementary | 15 | 5.20                  | .56  | 1.55    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Middleton J.H.    | 49 | 5.23                  | .55  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Morningside S.H.  | 28 | 5.00                  | .54  |         |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | Carson Elementary | 14 | 5.93                  | .27  | 2.47    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Middleton J.H.    | 51 | 5.51                  | .68  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Morningside S.H.  | 28 | 5.50                  | .75  |         |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>In order to calculate F-ratios, categorical responses have been treated as ratings on an "agreement" continuum (No=4, Unsure=5, Yes=6).

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

\*\*  $p \leq .01$ .

Table 10

Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Sites Within  
Jackson School District on Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Site <sup>b</sup> | n  | Response <sup>a</sup> |     |         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----|-----------------------|-----|---------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                |                   |    | Mean                  | SD  | F-ratio |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | Norwood Elem.     | 18 | 4.83                  | .86 | 1.57    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden J.H.       | 31 | 5.16                  | .90 |         |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | Norwood Elem.     | 18 | 5.78                  | .55 | .03     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden J.H.       | 31 | 5.81                  | .60 |         |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | Norwood Elem.     | 18 | 5.94                  | .24 | 1.97    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden J.H.       | 30 | 5.77                  | .50 |         |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institution? (e.g., workshops)                                                                    | Norwood Elem.     | 18 | 5.78                  | .65 | 1.64    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden J.H.       | 30 | 5.47                  | .90 |         |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | Norwood Elem.     | 18 | 4.28                  | .67 | .02     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden J.H.       | 32 | 4.25                  | .62 |         |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | Norwood Elem.     | 17 | 5.41                  | .87 | 2.37    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden J.H.       | 31 | 5.00                  | .89 |         |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | Norwood Elem.     | 17 | 5.00                  | .79 | .15     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden J.H.       | 31 | 4.90                  | .83 |         |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | Norwood Elem.     | 18 | 5.00                  | .34 | 1.70    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden J.H.       | 31 | 5.16                  | .45 |         |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | Norwood Elem.     | 18 | 5.06                  | .42 | .28     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden J.H.       | 31 | 5.13                  | .50 |         |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | Norwood Elem.     | 18 | 5.11                  | .32 | 1.83    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden J.H.       | 30 | 5.30                  | .54 |         |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | Norwood Elem.     | 17 | 5.77                  | .56 | 1.84    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Linden J.H.       | 30 | 5.50                  | .66 |         |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>In order to calculate F-ratios, categorical responses have been treated as ratings on an "agreement" continuum (No=4, Unsure=5, Yes=6).

<sup>b</sup>Data are incomplete for Jackson School District since questionnaire was not administered at Bellevue S.H.

other two school districts, there were no significant differences between the two sites in Jackson School District for any questions, i.e., the faculty/staff were very similar at both Norwood Elementary and Linden Junior High.

Table 11 presents the results of an analysis of differences between sites within Suburban Park School District for each question. The results show that significant site differences emerged for 5 questions. The first difference between the Suburban Park sites concerned whether or not schools should attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping. The most agreement came from faculty/staff at Central Senior High ( $\bar{x}=5.80$ ) while the lowest agreement was from Valley View Junior High faculty/staff ( $\bar{x}=5.45$ ). The three Suburban Park sites also differed in regard to the levels of faculty/staff awareness and assistance/cooperation with BORN FREE. In both concerns, Glenwood Elementary had the highest levels ( $\bar{x}=6.00$ ,  $\bar{x}=5.19$ ) while Central Senior High had the lowest levels ( $\bar{x}=5.69$ ,  $\bar{x}=4.21$ ). Significant site differences also emerged concerning both the project's impact on institutional policies/procedures and faculty/staff support for continuation. The most impact regarding institutional change occurred at Glenwood Elementary ( $\bar{x}=5.25$ ) while the lowest was at Central Senior High. The highest faculty/staff support for continuation was at Glenwood Elementary ( $\bar{x}=5.450$ ) with the lowest at Valley View Junior High ( $\bar{x}=4.79$ ). Aside from the site differences on the second attitude questions, all other site differences show the elementary level site, Glenwood, had consis-



Table 11

Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Sites Within  
Suburban Park School District on Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Site             | n  | Response <sup>a</sup> |     |         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|----|-----------------------|-----|---------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                |                  |    | Mean                  | SD  | F-ratio |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | Glenwood Elem.   | 21 | 5.43                  | .87 | 2.11    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View J.H. | 47 | 4.96                  | .96 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central S.H.     | 65 | 5.22                  | .93 |         |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | Glenwood Elem.   | 21 | 5.67                  | .58 | 4.20*   |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View J.H. | 47 | 5.45                  | .80 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central S.H.     | 65 | 5.80                  | .51 |         |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | Glenwood Elem.   | 21 | 6.00                  | 0   | 5.59**  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View J.H. | 48 | 5.96                  | .29 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central S.H.     | 62 | 5.69                  | .64 |         |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institution? (e.g., workshops)                                                                    | Glenwood Elem.   | 21 | 5.71                  | .72 | .59     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View J.H. | 48 | 5.79                  | .62 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central S.H.     | 65 | 5.65                  | .76 |         |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | Glenwood Elem.   | 21 | 5.19                  | .98 | 13.23** |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View J.H. | 48 | 4.44                  | .82 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central S.H.     | 66 | 4.21                  | .62 |         |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | Glenwood Elem.   | 21 | 5.52                  | .75 | 2.03    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View J.H. | 46 | 5.04                  | .89 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central S.H.     | 65 | 5.15                  | .97 |         |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | Glenwood Elem.   | 21 | 5.14                  | .91 | 1.85    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View J.H. | 48 | 4.83                  | .85 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central S.H.     | 64 | 4.72                  | .88 |         |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | Glenwood Elem.   | 21 | 4.81                  | .51 | .42     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View J.H. | 47 | 4.75                  | .61 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central S.H.     | 64 | 4.84                  | .54 |         |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | Glenwood Elem.   | 20 | 5.05                  | .39 | 2.03    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View J.H. | 48 | 4.83                  | .48 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central S.H.     | 63 | 4.79                  | .55 |         |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | Glenwood Elem.   | 20 | 5.25                  | .44 | 3.70*   |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View J.H. | 47 | 5.15                  | .55 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central S.H.     | 66 | 4.91                  | .65 |         |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | Glenwood Elem.   | 20 | 5.45                  | .76 | 6.00**  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Valley View J.H. | 47 | 4.79                  | .86 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Central S.H.     | 65 | 5.26                  | .87 |         |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>In order to calculate F-ratios, categorical responses have been treated as ratings on an "agreement" continuum (N=4, Unsure=5, Yes=6).

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

\*\*  $p \leq .01$ .

tently higher impact than the secondary level sites within the Suburban Park School District. While this, together with Glenwood School District, gives some credence to the notion that impact can be best achieved in elementary level sites, the sizes of the target audiences do differ significantly between the elementary and secondary level sites in Suburban Park.

Tables 12 to 14 show the results of analyses of questionnaire response differences between different groups of individuals.

Table 12 presents the results of an analysis of differences between team member and nonmember responses for each question. As was expected, the team members' responses were significantly higher or more positive than responses of nonmembers on all questions. In several questions, there was no variance at all in team member responses. The fact that significant differences are present between the team member and nonmember perceptions regarding the project's impact on faculty/staff as a whole, students, and institutional policies and procedures could be interpreted in two fashions. One, the team members' perceptions are biased, i.e., more positive than they actually are. The second interpretation is that team members' perceptions are more accurate since they are more aware of what the Project has attempted and accomplished. Both interpretations are possible.

Table 13 presents the results of an analysis of differences between female and male responses on each question. As was somewhat expected, female responses were significantly higher than male responses on most questions. There were, however, three questions where no significant sex differences emerged. These were questions

Table 12

Summary of T-Tests for Differences Between Total (All Sites)  
Team Member and Nonmember Responses on Project Impact Questionnaire

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Group                    | n         | Response <sup>a</sup> |            |                      |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|----------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                |                          |           | Mean                  | SD         | t-value <sup>b</sup> |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | Team Member<br>Nonmember | 36<br>421 | 6.00<br>5.36          | 0<br>.87   | 4.46**               |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | Team Member<br>Nonmember | 36<br>426 | 6.00<br>5.78          | 0<br>.55   | 2.42*                |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | Team Member<br>Nonmember | 36<br>416 | 6.00<br>5.78          | 0<br>.56   | 2.31*                |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | Team Member<br>Nonmember | 36<br>425 | 6.00<br>5.40          | 0<br>.91   | 3.94**               |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | Team Member<br>Nonmember | 36<br>427 | 6.00<br>4.49          | 0<br>.85   | 10.72**              |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | Team Member<br>Nonmember | 35<br>411 | 6.00<br>5.18          | 0<br>.92   | 5.26**               |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | Team Member<br>Nonmember | 33<br>403 | 5.89<br>4.95          | .49<br>.90 | 5.91**               |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | Team Member<br>Nonmember | 36<br>409 | 5.28<br>4.95          | .66<br>.57 | 3.21**               |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | Team Member<br>Nonmember | 35<br>409 | 5.37<br>4.96          | .73<br>.50 | 4.50**               |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | Team Member<br>Nonmember | 35<br>407 | 5.57<br>5.08          | .70<br>.58 | 4.69**               |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as on-going, integrated concerns or activities?                                                    | Team Member<br>Nonmember | 35<br>415 | 6.00<br>5.48          | 0<br>.74   | 4.17**               |

Note. Missing data on differences between team members and nonmembers at Bellevue H.S. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech. since questionnaire was not administered at these two sites.

<sup>a</sup>In order to calculate t-values, categorical responses have been treated as ratings on an "agreement" continuum (No=4, Unsure=5, Yes=6).

<sup>b</sup>T-tests are two tailed and use pooled variance.

\*p ≤ .05.

\*\*p ≤ .01.

Summary of T-Tests for Differences Between Total (All Sites)  
Female and Male Responses on Project Impact Questionnaire

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Group   | n   | Response <sup>a</sup> |     |                      |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-----|-----------------------|-----|----------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                |         |     | Mean                  | SD  | t-value <sup>b</sup> |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | Females | 236 | 5.52                  | .80 | 2.82**               |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Males   | 206 | 5.29                  | .88 |                      |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | Females | 235 | 5.94                  | .29 | 6.07**               |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Males   | 212 | 5.64                  | .68 |                      |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE AND the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | Females | 234 | 5.86                  | .48 | 1.96**               |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Males   | 204 | 5.76                  | .59 |                      |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | Females | 236 | 5.51                  | .86 | 1.19                 |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Males   | 210 | 5.41                  | .90 |                      |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | Females | 236 | 4.71                  | .95 | 2.36**               |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Males   | 212 | 4.51                  | .86 |                      |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | Females | 226 | 5.43                  | .85 | 4.35**               |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Males   | 205 | 5.06                  | .94 |                      |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | Females | 221 | 5.15                  | .89 | 2.90**               |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Males   | 201 | 4.89                  | .91 |                      |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | Females | 226 | 4.98                  | .55 | 0.13                 |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Males   | 205 | 4.97                  | .63 |                      |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | Females | 224 | 5.11                  | .50 | 4.96**               |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Males   | 206 | 4.85                  | .56 |                      |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | Females | 226 | 5.14                  | .57 | 0.64                 |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Males   | 202 | 5.10                  | .65 |                      |
| 11. Do you feel that Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                         | Females | 230 | 5.75                  | .32 | 7.56**               |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Males   | 205 | 5.26                  | .82 |                      |

Note. Missing data on differences between female and male responses at Bellevue H.S. and Oak Creek Vt. Tech. since questionnaire was not administered at these two sites.

<sup>a</sup>In order to calculate t-values, categorical responses have been treated as ratings on an "agreement" continuum (No=4, Unsure=5, Yes=6).

<sup>b</sup>T-tests are two tailed and use pooled variance. 82

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

\*\*  $p \leq .01$ .



concerning participation in BORN FREE activities, project's impact on faculty/staff as a whole, and project's impact on institutional policies and procedures.

Table 14 presents the results of an analysis of differences between responses of teachers, administrators, counselors, and other faculty/staff for each question. Six significant differences among these groups emerged. The first two significant differences concerned the two attitude questions. On the question of students' career options being limited by career-related sex-role stereotyping, administrators were most affirmative ( $\bar{x}=5.75$ ) while teachers were least affirmative ( $\bar{x}=5.31$ ). Regarding whether schools should attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping, counselors were most affirmative ( $\bar{x}=5.98$ ) while teachers again were the least positive ( $\bar{x}=5.73$ ). Concerning involvement with project, administrators had the highest levels of participation and assistance/cooperation ( $\bar{x}=5.66$ ,  $\bar{x}=5.17$ ), while counselors had the lowest level of participation ( $\bar{x}=5.19$ ) and other faculty (e.g., clerical, teacher's aide) assisted/cooperated the least ( $\bar{x}=4.53$ ). Counselors gave highest indication of project impact on faculty/staff as a whole ( $\bar{x}=5.14$ ) while teachers gave the lowest ( $\bar{x}=4.91$ ). Finally, significant differences between these groups emerged on the question of project continuation. The highest support came from administrators ( $\bar{x}=5.90$ ) while the least support came from teachers ( $\bar{x}=5.37$ ).

#### Description of the Change Process Variables

The data presented and discussed here are limited to a brief

Table 14

Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Project Impact Questionnaire Responses of Teachers, Administrators, Counselors and Other Faculty/Staff

| Question                                                                                                                                                                | Group               | n   | Response <sup>a</sup> |      |         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----|-----------------------|------|---------|
|                                                                                                                                                                         |                     |     | Mean                  | SD   | F-ratio |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                          | Teachers            | 298 | 5.31                  | .88  | 4.41**  |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Administrators      | 40  | 5.75                  | .59  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Counselors          | 52  | 5.60                  | .77  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Other Faculty/Staff | 51  | 5.45                  | .86  |         |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                   | Teachers            | 299 | 5.73                  | .60  | 4.93**  |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Administrators      | 41  | 5.30                  | .38  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Counselors          | 54  | 5.98                  | .14  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Other Faculty/Staff | 52  | 5.88                  | .43  |         |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                | Teachers            | 295 | 5.77                  | .58  | 1.62    |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Administrators      | 39  | 5.92                  | .35  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Counselors          | 52  | 5.90                  | .36  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Other Faculty/Staff | 51  | 5.78                  | .61  |         |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                            | Teachers            | 298 | 5.52                  | .84  | 4.23**  |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Administrators      | 41  | 5.66                  | .76  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Counselors          | 54  | 5.19                  | .99  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Other Faculty/Staff | 52  | 5.23                  | .98  |         |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students) | Teachers            | 301 | 4.55                  | .88  | 6.01**  |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Administrators      | 41  | 5.17                  | 1.00 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Counselors          | 54  | 4.67                  | .95  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Other Faculty/Staff | 51  | 4.53                  | .88  |         |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                            | Teachers            | 293 | 5.19                  | .92  | 2.12    |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Administrators      | 39  | 5.54                  | .82  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Counselors          | 50  | 5.24                  | .94  |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                         | Other Faculty/Staff | 48  | 5.40                  | .87  |         |

Table 14 (continued)

Summary of F-Tests for Differences Between Project Impact Questionnaire Responses of Teachers, Administrators, Counselors and Other Faculty/Staff

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Group               | n   | Response <sup>a</sup> |     |         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|---------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                |                     |     | Mean                  | SD  | F-ratio |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | Teachers            | 286 | 4.97                  | .91 | 1.61    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Administrators      | 38  | 5.29                  | .87 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Counselors          | 49  | 5.06                  | .90 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Other Faculty/Staff | 48  | 5.10                  | .91 |         |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | Teachers            | 293 | 4.91                  | .57 | 4.14**  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Administrators      | 39  | 5.13                  | .70 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Counselors          | 49  | 5.14                  | .61 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Other Faculty/Staff | 49  | 5.10                  | .55 |         |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | Teachers            | 294 | 4.97                  | .54 | .91     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Administrators      | 39  | 5.03                  | .54 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Counselors          | 48  | 4.98                  | .57 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Other Faculty/Staff | 48  | 5.10                  | .52 |         |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | Teachers            | 290 | 5.11                  | .59 | 1.05    |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Administrators      | 39  | 5.13                  | .77 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Counselors          | 49  | 5.08                  | .64 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Other Faculty/Staff | 49  | 5.27                  | .53 |         |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | Teachers            | 290 | 5.37                  | .78 | 15.44** |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Administrators      | 41  | 5.90                  | .38 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Counselors          | 52  | 5.87                  | .35 |         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Other Faculty/Staff | 51  | 5.75                  | .56 |         |

Note. Missing data on differences between response of Teachers, Administrators, Counselors and Other Faculty/Staff at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech. since questionnaire was not administered at these two sites.

<sup>a</sup>In order to calculate F-ratios, categorical responses have been treated as ratings on an "agreement" continuum (No=4, Unsure=5, Yes=6).

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

\*\*  $p \leq .01$ .

outline and description of the 51 change process variables which have been tentatively identified as influential in the second year change process occurring at the collaborating sites. These data have been generated through a system of rating each site on the various change process variables. The ratings reported here were done by the change process evaluator and project consultants during the final months of the project, after all implementation activities had been completed at the sites.

As indicated in the methodology section, results of regression analyses had been planned as the major data to be presented here, but these analyses could not be completed because of problems with severe multi-collinearity within the change process variables. It was possible to perform simple correlational analyses, one of which examined the relationships among the 51 change process variables and another which examined the relationships between the change process variables and Project Impact Questionnaire. Due to severe time limitations as well as growing genuine concerns about the adequacy of the data and appropriateness of the analyses, these tables showing the results of the correlational analyses are not discussed here. The tables, however, are provided in Appendix E.

Table 15 presents the means and standard deviations of the 51 change process variables measured across the fourteen project sites. These 51 change process variables are divided into four classes: project characteristics, institutional characteristics, team characteristics, and implementation characteristics. As indicated in the footnotes, for the dichotomous variables, numbers in



Table 15  
Means and Standard Deviations (SD) of Change Process Variables

| Change Process Variables <sup>a</sup> |                                                                            | Mean  | SD   |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------|
| Project Characteristics               | 1. Monthly consultant hours with sites                                     | 10.29 | 4.43 |
|                                       | 2. Helpfulness/importance of consultants                                   | 3.57  | .85  |
|                                       | 3. Helpfulness/importance of Project Director                              | 3.74  | 1.10 |
|                                       | 4. Helpfulness/importance of Project materials                             | 3.71  | 1.00 |
|                                       | 5. Helpfulness/importance of Project newsletter                            | 3.79  | .70  |
|                                       | 6. Helpfulness/importance of All-Project meetings                          | 3.43  | .85  |
|                                       | 7. Helpfulness/importance of financial support                             | 3.36  | 1.01 |
|                                       | 8. Amount of status/prestige conferred by Project participation            | 2.71  | 1.00 |
|                                       | 9. Team felt hassled with general requirements and expectations of Project | (9)   | (5)  |
|                                       | 10. Team felt hassled with field test requirements of Project              | (10)  | (4)  |
|                                       | 11. Team felt hassled with evaluation requirements of Project              | (11)  | (3)  |
| Institutional Characteristics         | 12. Economic-political state of institution                                | 2.93  | 1.21 |
|                                       | 13. Perceived workloads of faculty/staff                                   | 2.86  | .95  |
|                                       | 14. Faculty/staff morale                                                   | 2.64  | 1.34 |
|                                       | 15. Openness of institution's communication channels                       | 2.93  | 1.27 |
|                                       | 16. Immediate/building administrative support for Project                  | 3.21  | 1.48 |
|                                       | 17. High/central administrative support for Project                        | 3.43  | 1.02 |
|                                       | 18. Overall faculty/staff receptiveness to Project (interest)              | 2.71  | .83  |
|                                       | 19. Extent of sex-role stereotyping in institution (need)                  | 3.29  | 1.07 |
|                                       | 20. Amount of past career education programs/projects at institution       | 2.93  | 1.00 |
|                                       | 21. How well received past career education programs/projects were         | 2.86  | 1.03 |
|                                       | 22. Amount of past Affirmative Action programs/projects at institution     | 2.86  | .95  |
|                                       | 23. How well received past Affirmative Action programs/projects were       | 2.29  | .91  |
|                                       | 24. Institution's present involvement with other federal programs/projects | 2.21  | 1.36 |
|                                       | 25. General relations between female and male faculty/staff                | 3.07  | 1.14 |
|                                       | 26. Overall faculty/staff receptiveness to staff development efforts       | 3.21  | 1.42 |

Table 15 (continued)  
Means and Standard Deviations (SD) of Change Process Variables

| Change Process Variables <sup>a</sup> |                                                                | Mean | SD   |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|
| Team Characteristics                  | 27. Team complete by first quarter                             | (8)  | (6)  |
|                                       | 28. Both females and males on team                             | (10) | (4)  |
|                                       | 29. Counselor on team                                          | (11) | (3)  |
|                                       | 30. Administrator on team                                      | (5)  | (9)  |
|                                       | 31. Teacher on team                                            | (12) | (2)  |
|                                       | 32. Cohesiveness of team                                       | 3.00 | 1.18 |
|                                       | 33. Team leader's commitment to Project                        | 3.57 | 1.28 |
|                                       | 34. Other team members' commitment to Project                  | 2.93 | .92  |
|                                       | 35. All members very committed to Project                      | (6)  | (8)  |
|                                       | 36. Task orientation/planfulness of team                       | 3.07 | 1.27 |
|                                       | 37. Maintenance orientation/group support of team              | 3.07 | 1.33 |
|                                       | 38. Team's relations and power with faculty/staff (potency)    | 3.43 | 1.02 |
|                                       | 39. Team's interest in their own self improvement as educators | 3.71 | .73  |
| Implementation Characteristics        | 40. Implementation activities were high risk, novel            | (3)  | (11) |
|                                       | 41. Original implementation plans changed                      | (12) | (2)  |
|                                       | 42. Conducted more activities than originally planned          | (5)  | (9)  |
|                                       | 43. Conducted fewer activities than originally planned         | (7)  | (7)  |
|                                       | 44. Amount of implementation activities                        | 3.00 | 1.41 |
|                                       | 45. Conducted major involuntary faculty/staff inservice        | (6)  | (8)  |
|                                       | 46. Conducted voluntary inservices/workshops                   | (7)  | (7)  |
|                                       | 47. Attempted permanent change (e.g., curriculum development)  | (11) | (3)  |
|                                       | 48. Size of target audience                                    | 3.43 | 1.34 |
|                                       | 49. Students included in target audience                       | (6)  | (8)  |
|                                       | 50. Parents included in target audience                        | (3)  | (11) |
|                                       | 51. Developed formal continuation plans for next year          | (9)  | (5)  |

Note. Each of the 14 Project sites received a single rating on each listed change process variable; thus, the n for each change process variable is 14.

<sup>a</sup>Thirty-two of the change process variables are assured as continuous, while 19 change process variables are treated as dichotomous variables (Yes or No). For the 19 dichotomous variables frequencies of Yes and No (in parentheses) are substituted for means and standard deviations. While the first change process variable (Monthly Consultant hours per site) ranges from 6 to 15 hours, all remaining continuous change process variables are rated on a 5 point continuum. In all of these variables except one (faculty/staff morale, which got accidentally reversed) a 5 rating indicates the highest/largest or most positive value.

parentheses indicating the number of sites at which a given characteristic does and does not apply are substituted for means and standard deviations. No conclusions about the importance or influence of these change process variables can be made on the basis of the statistics shown here. However, by examining the correlation tables in Appendix E, several hypotheses about change process can be generated from examining significant relationships between the change process variables. The implementation characteristics, which describe the actual implementation activities across sites, are particularly interesting (e.g., examining relationships between various institutional and/or team characteristics with implementation characteristics).

## V. Conclusions

### Summary and Discussion

Project BORN FREE is a collaborative training and development effort of University-based counseling psychologists and field site teachers, counselors, and administrators. It has produced training materials and training designs to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in 14 educational institutions from elementary school through postsecondary/higher education (see Evaluation of Educational Change Process in Project BORN FREE Institutions [Keiferleber and Hansen, 1978] and Case Summaries of Educational Change Process in Project BORN FREE Institutions, Technical Report No. 7 [Keiferleber, 1978]).

This is one of three technical reports, each of which describes a specific evaluation area or component of Project BORN FREE during its second and final year of funding. The systematic evaluation which played a major role in Project BORN FREE's two years can be viewed as three main evaluation components: (1) Product Evaluation, (2) Change Process Evaluation, and (3) BORN FREE Training Institute Evaluation. Each has different goals and methodologies.

The purposes of this report on evaluation of change process and Project implementation are: (1) to document the change process evaluation design, procedures, and methodologies; (2) to present and discuss the evaluation data on implementation activities, Project impact, and change process variables operating at participating institutions; and (3) to provide tentative conclusions and



recommendations on attempting and evaluating change agent efforts in educational institutions.

### Conceptual Design

During the second year of the Project, the staff included a .50 time product evaluator, a .50 time change process evaluator, and a .25 time general evaluator whose tasks were to conduct computer analyses and assist on quarterly and technical reports. The first year's change process evaluator had resigned to work on his doctoral thesis, and the resulting change in staff created some difficulties. Despite transition problems, however, the original evaluation design continued to function with some modifications. In addition to the three major evaluation components, the evaluators conducted a follow-up evaluation of the 1977 Local Summer Training Institute, of all-Project meetings, and of the BORN FREE Dean's Seminar with College of Education faculty, and assisted in non-evaluation tasks such as presentations, viewers' guides, and tasks related to the National Training Institute in June, 1978.

Originally the change process evaluation had been concerned primarily with monitoring progress related to development of Project materials: systemsdiagnoses, literature reviews, and print training packets. Since some of the field sites initiated implementation activities in the first year, ahead of the Project timeline, the process evaluation was revised, and a decision was made to use the Rand Model of educational change as a framework. The change process evaluator adapted the Rand Model of initiation, implementa-

tion, and outcome and continuation to fit BORN FREE's goals. To study the change process he conducted interviews and analyzed systems diagnoses and the second-year implementation plans which had been developed by participants in the 1977 Local BORN FREE Training Institute. Changes in process in the second year focused on documenting the actual implementation activities occurring at the institutions to determine what impact resulted. Differences in data collection in the second year included changes in the formats of the forms used; the attempt to collect detailed evaluation data during each major activity through Major Activity Reports and standardized Workshop Evaluation Forms for BORN FREE workshops/in-services; an impact questionnaire developed and administered at the end of the second year to faculty/staff at 12 of the 14 institutions; and inclusion of quantitative analyses in addition to the qualitative analyses done in the first year.

Data collection at the 1978 National Institute differed from collection at the 1977 Local Institute in that additional methodologies included: separate retreat evaluation forms, daily reports by Institute staff; participant observations by evaluators; and ongoing formative evaluation during the Institute. Due to a change in goals, and the differing needs of the participants, the National Training Institute was revised as it was in progress, in response to data collected and participant needs.

The five goals of the second year's evaluation were to:

- 1) Monitor the implementation progress at each of the 14 local collaborating educational institutions.
- 2) Record significant or major BORN FREE implementation

activities that occurred at each collaborating institution.

- 3) Measure the impact or changes resulting from the BORN FREE implementation activities and chances for continuation.
- 4) Identify and describe change process variables operating at collaborating institutions which affected implementation progress.
- 5) Draw conclusions and make recommendations concerning the process of attempting innovative change in educational institutions.

While during the first year the objective was to study change process occurring at participating institutions, during the second year the goal was to document the actual BORN FREE implementation activities and to measure the impact or changes resulting from these activities; the study of change process per se thus became the secondary focus. There were differences in conceptualization and methodology between the two years, due to change in personnel and to differences in evaluation needs which emerged as the Project operationalized over time.

New instruments were developed according to perceived need. Procedures and tools used in evaluation were: site visits, Monthly Site Reports, Bi-monthly Progress Reports from Project Director, Quarterly Reports from Team Leaders, Major BORN FREE Activity Reports, bi-monthly site interviews, Evaluation of Project Status questionnaires, Workshop Evaluation Forms, Project Impact Questionnaires, and Reports on Administration of Project Impact Questionnaire.

#### Methodologies for Second-Year Change Process Evaluation

The original qualitative data analysis based on case studies

was concerned with identifying what implementation activities occurred at the sites, as well as the various change process variables operating at these institutions. The variables, adapted from the Rand Model of educational change in federal innovative projects, included Project characteristics, institutional characteristics, team characteristics, and implementation characteristics. Quantitative data analysis was added midway through the second year, with the Project Impact Questionnaire developed to meet the need for information about impact of activities.

Categorical responses were collected and later recoded as ratings on an agreement continuum so that additional quantitative analyses could be performed to examine for differences in responses between sites and particular groups of individuals, and to simplify data interpretation and reduce the number of required tables.

Change process variables were identified for sites, and several computer analyses were planned and attempted with these change process variable ratings for each site; however, due to the problem of severe multicollinearity between the variables, only simple correlation analyses were successfully performed. The regression analysis was modeled, to a degree, after the regression analyses used in the Rand Study which was part of the Project design (Berman and McLaughlin, 1974). The quantitative data analysis met with less than anticipated success, due to quality of data and extremely limited time available for conducting the change process evaluation. Perhaps qualitative methods would have been better employed even though those methods are likely to lead to oversimplification.



Summary and Analysis of Second-Year  
Change Process Evaluation Data

Implementation. Numerous implementation activities occurred at all but one high school in the second year. At two sites the implementation activities closely followed the plans from the 1977 Local Institute, but most were changed, hindering the initial attempt to assess implementation progress by comparing actual plans with original plans. At most sites the bulk of the activity occurred in the first six months; however, several sites did implement major activities in the third quarter. There seemed to be a peak level of activity which sites could implement. In sites which implemented early, field site staff persistence in their BORN FREE message created an overload, or backlash effect. One role of consultants was to act as a "buffer," to both encourage and/or discourage interventions when appropriate. The 66 activities (see Table I) involved a wide range of designs, the most frequent being presentations about BORN FREE and sex-role stereotyping issues with faculty/staff, parents, and community groups. Some teams worked directly with students, incorporated BORN FREE into their institutions through curricular development or revision, and worked to eliminate stereotyping and sexist language from their system's publicity brochures.

Impact. This is a two-way process, from Project to sites and from sites to Project. Limitations include the inability to obtain questionnaire data from all 14 sites; substantial differences in administration procedure; administration to all target audiences rather than to all faculty/staff; and representativeness

of samples where staffs were greater than 100 not verified. Because three sites had extremely low response rates, which may seriously jeopardize the generalizability of the questionnaire responses to the entire target audience, caution must be exercised in drawing conclusions on the basis of the data.

The analysis of data showed high levels of impact, awareness, participation, attitude change, and behavioral (mostly language) change. Levels of institutional policy change or student change were less clear (though it should be reiterated that students were not the target population, and no change could be expected). Impact varied as to the activity used; more activities at an institution correlated with higher impact, except at Valley View Junior High where in spite of high level of activity, impact appeared to be low. The impact was greater at elementary sites than at secondary level sites. As was expected, female responses on the impact questionnaire were significantly higher than males'. Administrators were most affirmative toward the Project, while teachers were the least affirmative of educators at the field sites. Team members were more positive, which might show either that their perceptions were biased, or more accurate. Administrators had the highest "levels of participation with the Project," while counselors had the lowest. "Others" (clerical, teachers' aides, etc.) "assisted/cooperated with the Project" the least. Counselors gave the highest indication of perceiving "Project impact on faculty as a whole," while teachers gave the lowest. Highest "support for Project continuation" came from administrators, while least support came from teachers.

### Continuation

There was high support from faculty and staff; from administrators, counselors, and women; and most teams have indicated commitment to continue the Project. The intent of such educational change projects as BORN FREE is to make permanent, lasting changes in the attitudes, behaviors, and practices of an institution and its staff to benefit students in the future. Unfortunately, when funding ceases, activities often cease.

Continuation plans which have been identified include the funding of \$4,000 per year at one elementary district for integrating BORN FREE materials into their guidance curriculum for two years. Many faculty plan to adapt materials for classroom use. Some field sites have created a task force to continue working on BORN FREE goals and issues. Some plan to integrate BORN FREE materials into specific subjects and discipline areas. Others plan to work through a career development committee to incorporate sex-role issues into the school's career education program. One plans to extend a model for a "Growing Up Female" day to "Growing Up Male." Still others plan to follow up the first year's implementation activities by building a series of volunteer faculty-parent seminars around the BORN FREE videotapes and discussion guides. These are just a few of the plans indicated by field site teams at the end of the school year.

On a national level the Project materials are being used by people in such places as state departments of education, demonstration career education projects, state sex equity training projects, counseling centers, and counselor education programs, and are being translated into Spanish in Puerto Rico. Plans developed by

states at the National Institute reveal ambitious goals for carrying out the multiplier effect through back-home workshops and other activities. While feedback has been received from almost 25 states, more formal evaluation of continuation in the states and territories must await a follow-up study in December, 1978.

#### Change Process Study

The study of change process, a complicated process because of the subjective nature of the research, ended due to lack of time for carrying out the qualitative analysis and to both generate variables and develop an adequate rating form. The Rand Model (Berman and McLaughlin, 1974) selected to examine change process in the first year was the basis for examining three phases of change process: initiation, implementation, and outcomes and continuation. A major concern was to determine whether the Project could have lasting effects upon the collaborating systems. Because the timeline of the Project was so short, attempts to measure enduring effects would be premature. Until such time as a follow-up study can be undertaken, little can be said about enduring effects of continuation plans within the participating systems, other than that all field site staffs indicated their intention to continue the implementation plans which they began.

Several change process principles guided the inception and implementation of BORN FREE (see Keierleber and Hansen, 1978, and Hansen and Keierleber, 1978). Because individuals like to be involved from the beginning in an innovation that will affect them,



representatives from each participating institution were involved in the original planning. Factors which affected the degree of success at different institutions were such determinants as: prior knowledge of sex-role socialization, career development, or both; the identification of internal consultants who were leaders in their own system; genuine and public administrative support; institutional "ownership" of problems; structure and support from Project staff; flexibility in the process, to encourage and enable each institution to be creative and to design plans which were appropriate for each individual situation; cognitive and experiential training provided; cooperative development of materials to be used, assuming that people are more likely to use what they help create; and providing rewards and incentives for participation to maintain morale and continued involvement (Hansen and Keierleber, 1978). Turnovers in staff at field sites and at the University impeded the progress of the Project. Layoffs due to attrition in the field site schools were a demoralizing influence on the Project. In fact, one target school withdrew, with the result that the replacement school which became involved in the second year never reached the degree of involvement which was attained by those institutions involved in the creation of the Project from the beginning.

In the change process study, a large amount of work was attempted, but the results were not totally significant. Fifty-one variables (Project characteristics, institutional characteristics, team characteristics, and implementation characteristics) were identified and rated by the change process evaluator and level

consultants. Little difference was found between school sites, although the overall data seem to indicate, in spite of strong individual resistance, a positive effect on the participants through their involvement in BORN FREE. Some of the consultant reports indicated more positive outcomes than reflected in the subjective open-ended responses on the impact questionnaire. These results are reported in Table 15. Differences which do occur are reported in a number of tables in Chapter IV, and institutional responses are summarized in the tables in Appendix E.

#### Subjective Indicators of Project Change

Although subjective indicators of the impact of Project BORN FREE are not the subject of this report, a few examples need to be cited here. The Project Impact Questionnaire, while yielding much useful data on the impact of the Project on individuals and on institutions, did not include some of the evidence of change which already had been documented. For example, in communication with field sites, it has been reported that one community college changed their student orientation handbook to include considerable emphasis on career development, sex-role stereotyping, and nontraditional choices, in an effort to encourage wider options in student career decisions. Another developed a slide/tape presentation which is being shown to every new student at orientation. Evidence of gender-linked language changes in publicity brochures, college catalogs, and orientation materials has also been reported.

One elementary school, as reported earlier, pledged \$4,000 for two years to increase sex equity through incorporating BORN

FREE materials into the school's guidance curriculum. Task forces and career development committees have been created through which BORN FREE goals will continue to be implemented in the participating institutions.

The 40 participants who first experienced and field tested the BORN FREE training packets and first videotape in a two-week training design rated the training 6.44 on a 7.0 scale (Keierleber, 1977). These ratings were maintained one year later in a follow-up study to determine long-range effects of the training (Warsett, 1978).

On a national level, there is already considerable evidence of Project impact. More than 500 individuals and institutions have asked to be part of a BORN FREE network and are on the newsletter mailing list. Almost 75 speeches/workshops have been carried out by BORN FREE staff, adding to the multiplier effect. Of the more than 100 educators who attended the 1978 BORN FREE National Institute, over 75 have asked to use or field test the BORN FREE videotapes; about 25 have indicated that they are conducting workshops in their home state using Project materials and training. The Project materials are being used by educators (counselors, teachers, administrators, career education directors, sex equity coordinators, professors) in state departments of education, counselor education programs, counseling centers, demonstration career education projects, and state sex equity training projects. All these provide some evidence of national impact of BORN FREE as a change agent project. For a complete report on the 1978 BORN FREE National Institute, see Technical Report No. 10 (Penn, 1978).

### Conclusion

Many of the events relating to educational change in the two years of Project BORN FREE may seem like minor accomplishments, but the positive effects of the Project on participating individuals and institutions cannot be denied. The subtlety of the long range effects of the Project causes them to be nearly impossible to research. The two-year timeline itself, in which major goals were development and field-testing of multi-media training materials, precludes any definitive statements about long-range effects.

A great deal of analysis was attempted, but the results are somewhat disappointing due to the lack of time for complete analysis and due to the subjective nature of the material. All change process data both years was analyzed by the process evaluator for that year to assure continuity of analysis. Although the Rand Model of educational change provided a broad framework, different goals, data collection methods, and analyses were used in the two years, causing some discontinuity. The qualitative analysis which characterized the case summary approach of the first year provided an exploratory study of the change process in the BORN FREE institutions. The quantitative analysis of the second year became an unmanageable task and produced minimal results. Thus it becomes difficult to say much about the study of change process per se in the second year of the Project. The Project Impact Questionnaire did produce some tangible and useful results which have been reported here. Data analysis became a herculean task which ended when the Project ended and still



remains somewhat incomplete.

In spite of the limitations of time, staff, and funding for a Project monumental in size and scope, BORN FREE appears to have had considerable success in achieving its goals. Although there are clear and not unexpected examples of resistance in the impact questionnaire data, there is also evidence of positive impact on those affected in the 12 institutions reporting. Subjective indicators of impact have not been the subject of this report and are only alluded to here; they are discussed in the Annual and Final Report (Hansen and Mills-Novoa, 1978). Interest in the BORN FREE materials developed increases daily, and the beliefs and attitudes which were affected and internalized by the individuals involved in the Project will continue to have an effect upon their institutions and their students in the future, as they consciously and/or unconsciously work toward reducing sex-role stereotyping in career options for boys and girls, women and men.

This report is only one of three which have documented the evaluation of Project BORN FREE in its second year of existence. All the technical reports on product evaluation (No. 4 and 9) and on training institute evaluation (No. 5 and 10) provide considerable evidence of the effectiveness of Project multi-media materials and training designs used in both local and national implementation.

It is clear that the data presented on change process in the BORN FREE institutions in this report must be viewed with caution. Because the study of change process is difficult and time-consuming, as well as idiosyncratic to each institution, findings cannot be

generalized across institutions. While 51 change process variables have been identified, their usefulness is also limited for the reasons already cited. Data reported on each institution may be the most important for purposes of this study. It may be that to attempt to systematically study change in the framework of the Rand Model was simply too ambitious a task for a project of this size, scope, duration, and budget. It may have been a mistake to attempt a quantitative analysis. Nonetheless the evaluation goals, procedures, methodologies, and analysis should prove useful to those planning change in the area of career-related sex-role stereotyping in educational institutions. Perhaps the Project Impact Questionnaire results, even with their limitations, will prove to be the most useful indicator of change in Project BORN FREE institutions in the very short time in which the Project has been in existence.

## REFERENCES

- Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M.W. Federal programs supporting educational change, vol. I: A model of educational change (R-1589/1-HEW). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, September, 1974.
- Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M.W. Federal programs supporting educational change, vol. IV: The findings in review (R-1589/4-HEW). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, April, 1975.
- Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M.W. Federal programs supporting educational change, vol. VII: Factors affecting implementation and continuation (R-1589/7-HEW). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, April, 1977.
- Fernandes, Kathleen. Project BORN FREE case study: The first year's findings. Women's Educational Equity Act Program, USOE, Washington, D.C., March, 1978.
- Greenwood, P.W., Mann, D., & McLaughlin, M.W. Federal programs supporting educational change, vol. III: The process of change (R-1589/3-HEW). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, April, 1975.
- Hansen, L.S. & Keierleber, D. BORN FREE: A collaborative consultation model for career development and sex-role stereotyping. Personnel and Guidance Journal, March, 1978, 395-399.
- Hansen, L.S. & Mills-Novoa, B. Project BORN FREE annual and final report. Women's Educational Equity Act, USOE, Grant #565AH70023. College of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, October, 1978.
- Keierleber, D.L. Evaluation of the 1977 BORN FREE summer institute: A workshop model to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping. Technical Report No. 5, Project BORN FREE, College of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, August, 1977.
- Keierleber, D.L. Case summaries of the educational change process in Project BORN FREE institutions, 1976-1977. Technical Report No. 7, Project BORN FREE, College of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, May, 1978.
- Keierleber, D.L. & Hansen, L.S. Evaluation of educational change process in Project BORN FREE institutions, 1977-1978. Technical Report No. 6, Project BORN FREE, College of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, May, 1978.
- Penn, P. Evaluation of the 1978 BORN FREE national institute: A workshop model to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping. Technical Report, No. 10, Project BORN FREE, College of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, October, 1978.
- Warsett, S. Evaluation Report on BORN FREE videotapes, training packets and selected workshops. Technical Report No. 9, Project BORN FREE, College of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, October, 1978.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Project Abstract

Appendix B

Listing of BORN FREE Products and Publications

Appendix C

Components of Project BORN FREE Evaluation in  
Second Year

Appendix D

Second-Year Change Process Evaluation Instruments  
with Accompanying Administration Guidelines

Appendix E

Supplemental Change Process Evaluation Data  
Tables (E-1 to E-28)



Appendix A  
Project Abstract

Appendix B  
Project BORN FREE



Build Options Reassess Norms Free Roles through Educational Equity

BORN FREE Products and Publications

October, 1978

Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology  
Department of Psychoeducational Studies  
College of Education  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Funded under a grant by the Women's Educational Equity Act Program,  
United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education,  
and Welfare, Washington, D.C. Grant #565AH70023

## Appendix B-2

### I. PRINT TRAINING MATERIALS

These three training packets, combined with videotapes, form the core of the BORN FREE training materials. Each packet consists of 1) an introductory section with self-contained guidelines for users, 2) a set of experiential and cognitive learning strategies designed to help educators and parents change their attitudes and behaviors to expand career options for both women and men, 3) reprints of numerous articles and handouts used in the strategies, 4) a specially compiled Fact Pack with statistics on the status of women and men in the labor force, 5) an extensive set of references.

Hansen, L.S., Pelcak, D., Perreault, G., & Dege, D. BORN FREE Training Packet to Reduce Sex-Role Stereotyping in Career Development: Elementary Level, October, 1978

Hansen, L.S., Hatfield, T., Johnson, D., Teeson, T., Harper, J., & Perreault, G. BORN FREE Training Packet to Reduce Sex-Role Stereotyping in Career Development: Secondary Level, October, 1978.

Hansen, L.S., Perreault, G., Lofgren, B., Follett, C., Watt, M.A., & Boe, A. BORN FREE Training Packet to Reduce Sex-Role Stereotyping in Career Development: Postsecondary/Higher Education Level, October, 1978.

### II. VIDEOTAPE TRAINING MATERIALS

BORN FREE has produced nine half-hour color videotapes and viewers' guides which are an integral part of the training materials. The tapes are built around developmental themes of career socialization drawn from the literature reviews. They were also based on problems identified in systems analyses completed by pilot institutions. The tapes were developed by L. Sunny Hansen, Director, and Phyllis Krogseth, Media Specialist, with technical production by University Media Resources, Arnold Walker, Executive Producer. Dolores Dege coordinated development of the viewers' guides. The tapes consist of interviews and vignettes largely of students, parents, and staff in the BORN FREE pilot institutions. "BORN FREE: A World of Options" received the Best Videotape Award in the American Personnel and Guidance Association Film Festival in Washington, D.C., March, 1978. It is hoped that the tapes eventually will be shown on broadcast television but that they will be used primarily in programs and workshops for educators and parents to promote sex equity in career options.

Videotape No. 1 - BORN FREE: A World of Options  
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Beverly Mills-Novoa,  
and L. Sunny Hansen

Videotape No. 2 - Men: Choices and Changes  
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Tim Hatfield,  
Beverly Mills-Novoa, and L. Sunny Hansen

## Appendix B-3

- Videotape No. 3 - Women: Choices and Changes  
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Gerri Perreault,  
Beverly Mills-Novoa, and L. Sunny Hansen
- Videotape No. 4 - The Joy of Choosing  
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Sue Warsett,  
L. Sunny Hansen, and Beverly Mills-Novoa
- Videotape No. 5 - Parenting - Three Generations  
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Phyllis Kragseth,  
L. Sunny Hansen, and Beverly Mills-Novoa
- Videotape No. 6 - Parents as Influencers  
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Phyllis Kragseth,  
Beverly Mills-Novoa, and L. Sunny Hansen
- Videotape No. 7 - Schools as Influencers  
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Doug Pelcak,  
L. Sunny Hansen, and Beverly Mills-Novoa
- Videotape No. 8 - Colleges as Influencers  
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Barbara Lofgren,  
Beverly Mills-Novoa, and L. Sunny Hansen
- Videotape No. 9 - Why Change?  
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Gerri Perreault,  
L. Sunny Hansen, and Beverly Mills-Novoa

The videotape viewers' guides, designed for workshop leaders, consist of a general introductory section on the purpose of the Project, the tapes, and guides, and a discussion of how the materials can be integrated into training workshops. Brief information is provided on career development, sex-role socialization, and change process, as well as on the development, rationale, and format of the tapes. A section on guidelines for showing the tapes reviews aspects of group process and provides discussion hints for conducting workshops on this topic. The last part of each guide presents an overview of the purpose of each tape, a summary of initial field test results, and a set of questions relating to each tape segment. (Approximately 20 pages each.)

### III. SUPPLEMENTARY TRAINING MATERIALS

The reviews of literature are designed to provide documentation of the need for attention to reducing sex bias in career development of all persons. They attempt to answer the questions, "What do we know about 'career socialization' at different levels of development, and what can we do through home, school, and college to reduce the barriers and expand the facilitators of career options for women and men?"

#### A. Reviews of Literature

Pelcak, D. et al. Selected Review of the Literature on Career Development and Sex-Role Stereotyping at the Elementary Level. Technical Report No. 1, August, 1977. (64 pages)



Johnson, D., Harper, J., Hatfield, T., Teeson, T., and Hansen, L.S. Selected Review of the Literature on Career Development and Sex-Role Stereotyping at the Secondary Level. Technical Report No. 2, August, 1977. (100 pages)

Follett, C., Watt, M., Hansen, L.S., et al. Selected Review of the Literature on Career Development and Sex-Role Stereotyping at the Postsecondary/Higher Education Level. Technical Report No. 3, August, 1977. (113 pages)

#### B. Evaluation Reports

BORN FREE completed extensive evaluation of both its products and process. The product evaluation reports provide data on the validation of the training packets and the videotapes. They also report on the effectiveness of the BORN FREE training designs carried out in one state workshop and one national institute. Some data are also provided on workshops developed in pilot institutions.

The process reports provide exploratory evaluation of the process by which BORN FREE was carried out in the 14 pilot schools and colleges over a two-year period. The change process is analyzed according to the Rand Model of Educational Change, examining what happened as field site staff, in consultation with University staff, made plans for initiation, implementation, and continuation of BORN FREE efforts in their institutions. The reports can be extremely useful to those attempting to bring about educational change in the area of sex equity in career options.

Warsett, S. Evaluation Report on Field Testing of Color Video Cassette and Training Packets. Technical Report No. 4, August, 1977. (65 pages)

Warsett, S. Evaluation Report on BORN FREE Videotapes, Training Packets and Selected Workshops. Technical Report No. 9, October 1978, (approximately 100 pages)

Keierleber, D. Evaluation of the 1977 BORN FREE Summer Institute: A Workshop Model to Reduce Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping. Technical Report No. 5, August, 1977. (79 pages)

Penn, P. Evaluation of the 1978 BORN FREE National Institute: A Workshop Model to Reduce Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping. Technical Report No. 10, October, 1978. (approximately 75 pages)

Keierleber, D. & Hansen, L.S. Evaluation of Educational Change Process in Project BORN FREE Institutions, 1974-77. Technical Report No. 6, WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls., May, 1978. (117 pages)

Krusemark, F. Evaluation of the Educational Change Process in Project BORN FREE Institutions, 1977-78. Technical Report No. 8, October, 1978. (approximately 100 pages)

Keierleber, D. Case Summaries of the Educational Change Process in Project BORN FREE Institutions, 1976-77. Technical Report No. 7, WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls., May, 1978. (109 pages)

#### IV. PROJECT PROGRESS REPORTS

Project Progress Reports describe the internal development of Project BORN FREE over the two-year period. They describe each component of the Project, provide brief statements of developments in Project institutions, present evaluation highlights, include sample instruments and newsletters, discuss the process by which Project goals were carried out, and give a candid appraisal of problems and progress in carrying out a project of this scope.

Hansen, L.S. & Jones, L. Project BORN FREE First Quarterly Report, Women's Educational Equity Act, United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, College of Education, U of M, Mpls., December, 1976. (25 pages)

Hansen, L.S. Project BORN FREE Second Quarterly Report, WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls., March, 1977. (31 pages)

Hansen, L.S. Project BORN FREE Third Quarterly Report, WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls., June, 1977. (26 pages)

Hansen, L.S. & Mills-Novoa, B. Project BORN FREE Annual Report, September 9, 1976-August 31, 1977. WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls., October, 1977. (37 pages)

Hansen, L.S. & Mills-Novoa, B. Project BORN FREE First Quarterly Report, September 1, 1977-December 31, 1977, WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls. (39 pages)

Hansen, L.S. & Mills-Novoa, B. Project BORN FREE Second Quarterly Report, January 1, 1978-March 31, 1978, WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls. (49 pages)

Hansen, L.S. & Mills-Novoa, B. Project BORN FREE Third Quarterly Report, April 1-June 30, 1978, WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls. (48 pages)

Hansen, L.S. & Mills-Novoa, B. Project BORN FREE Final Report, September 1976-1978, WEEA, USOE, DHEW, College of Education, U of M, Mpls., October, 1978. (approximately 65 pages)

#### V. INFORMATION SHARING

##### A. Publications

Hansen, L.S. & Keierleber, D. BORN FREE: A Collaborative Consultation Model for Career Development and Sex-Role Stereotyping. Personnel and Guidance Journal, March, 1978, 395-399.

B. Papers Presented at National Conferences\*

- Johnson, D. "BORN FREE: Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping in Educational Institutions - Literature Review and Systems Analysis." APA, San Francisco, CA., August 29, 1977.
- Keierleber, D. "BORN FREE: Reducing Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping in Educational Institutions - Process and Product Evaluation." APA, San Francisco, CA., August 29, 1977.
- Hansen, L.S. "BORN FREE: Reducing Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping - Staff Development and Change Process." Paper presented at American Psychological Association National Convention, San Francisco, CA., August 29, 1977.
- Hansen, L.S. "An Applied Developmental Intervention to Reduce Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping in Elementary, Secondary, and Higher Education Settings." Paper presented as part of a symposium on "Educational Intervention to Promote Female Development--A Life Span View." American Psychological Association National Convention, San Francisco, CA., August 27, 1977.
- Hansen, L.S. "BORN FREE: Change Process Evaluation of a Psycho-educational Intervention to Reduce Career Sex-Role Stereotyping for Women and Men." Paper presented as part of a Symposium on "Cross-Cultural Sex Differences" at the American Educational Research Association Annual Convention, Toronto, Canada, March 30, 1978.

\* Numerous other workshops were held and speeches presented for local, state, and national conferences, organizations, and institutions.

C. Project Information

The following brochures, summaries, and newsletters have been created to provide descriptive information about the Project and the materials for those interested in issues of sex equity for both women and men.

Mills-Novoa, B. & Hansen, L.S. Project Abstract, March, 1978.

Mills-Novoa, B. & Staff. BORN FREE News. Bi-monthly newsletter to promote communication among BORN FREE institutions. The initial 14 schools and institutions of higher education participating in the project are Lincoln Elementary, Sunrise Junior High, and Mariner High School in White Bear Lake, MN.; Webster Elementary, Mounds Park Junior High, and Washington High School in St. Paul, MN.; Harley Hopkins Elementary, North Junior High, and Eisenhower High School in Hopkins, MN.; Lakewood Community College in White Bear Lake, MN.; Normandale Community College in Bloomington, MN.; Special Intermediate School District #976 in White Bear Lake, MN.; College of Liberal Arts Career Planning Office (University of Minnesota) in Minneapolis, MN.; and Augsburg College, Minneapolis, MN. The newsletter has been expanded to include the 107 participants in the 1978 National Institute as well as others around the nation concerned about sex bias in career options.



Hansen, L.S. BORN FREE Products and Publications. A listing and brief description of all the modules and reports produced by Project BORN FREE in the first two years of its existence.

Boe, D. Project Logo. The yellow and orange project logo, an original design, has been distributed as a public relations tool to arouse interest in BORN FREE and create awareness of the problems the Project addresses.

Dege, D. Videotape Abstracts. One-page description of each of the nine BORN FREE videotapes.

Kragseth, P. Videotape Overview. A brief description of the developmental themes and content of each of the nine BORN FREE videotapes.

## VI. DISSEMINATION

Materials will be reviewed for dissemination by the Education Development Center, 55 Chapel Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02160, (617)-969-7100 or 1-800-225-3088. EDC is the official WEEA project dissemination contractor.

Because of USOE dissemination restrictions, the length of our packets and reports, and budget limitations, we are unable to engage in general dissemination. However, selected information papers and reports are available (while supply lasts) for cost of reproduction and mailing.

For copies of abstract, information papers, or sample of training materials or to be put on newsletter mailing list for BORN FREE Network, contact:

L. Sunny Hansen, Professor and Director  
Project BORN FREE  
139 Burton Hall, 178 Pillsbury Drive SE  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN. 55455  
(612) 373-0202 or 373-5558

For dissemination information, contact:

Dissemination Center for Women's Educational  
Equity Act Programs  
Education Development Center  
55 Chapel Street  
Newton, Massachusetts 02160  
(617) 959-7100 or 1-800-225-3088



## APPENDIX C

### COMPONENTS OF PROJECT BORN FREE EVALUATION IN SECOND YEAR

#### I. Product Evaluation

##### A. Goals/Purposes:

1. Obtain information for revising training packets and videotapes.
2. Obtain normative information on training packets and videotape.

##### B. Procedures/Instruments

1. Individual critiques of training packets by selected readers.
2. Field test training packets and videotapes at collaborating institutions.
3. Field test training packets and videotapes at institutions other than collaborating institutions.
4. Completing of "External Field Test Report" by persons field testing project materials outside collaborating institutions.
5. Completion of "Learning Strategy Rating Form" by learning strategy participants.
6. Completion of "Videotape Evaluation Form" by viewers.

#### II. Change Process Evaluation

##### A. Goals/Purposes:

1. Monitor the implementation progress at each of 14 local collaborating educational institutions.
2. Record significant or major BORN FREE implementation activities that have occurred at each collaborating institution.
3. Measure the impacts or changes resulting from BORN FREE implementation activities.
4. Identify and describe change process variables operating at collaborating institutions which appear to facilitate or hinder implementation progress.

## APPENDIX C (continued)

5. Draw conclusions and make recommendations concerning (1) the process of attempting innovative change in educational institutions, and (2) the evaluation of "change agent" efforts.

### B. Procedures/Instruments

1. Site visits by project director, consultants and change process evaluator.
2. Completion of "Monthly Site Reports" by project consultants to the 14 collaborating sites.
3. Completion of "Bimonthly Project Status Reports" by project director.
4. Completion of "Quarterly Progress Report" by field site team leaders.
5. Completion of "Major BORN FREE Activity Report" by field site teams.
6. Bimonthly site interviews by all project evaluators.
7. Completing "Evaluation of Project Status" Questionnaire by project staff at second quarter all-project meeting.
8. Completion of "Workshop Evaluation Form" by workshop/activity participants.
9. Completion of "Project Impact Questionnaire" by faculty/staff at collaborating institutions.
10. Completion of "Report on Administration of Project Impact Questionnaire" by field site team leaders.

## III. National BORN FREE Training Institute Evaluation

### A. Goals/Purposes:

1. Conduct participant analysis for structuring institute goals and activities.
2. Continuous monitoring of institute to identify strengths and weaknesses for immediate and future revisions on institute.
3. Determine immediate impacts (expected and unexpected) of institute on participants.

APPENDIX C (continued)

B. Procedures/Instruments

1. Review participants' application materials (e.g., statements of expectations, various status variables).
2. Completion of "Pre-Assessment Survey" by institute participants.
3. Completion of "Daily Progress Reports" by developmental growth group leaders (staff).
4. Participant observations by project evaluators.
5. Completion of "Retreat Evaluation Form" by institute participants.
6. Completion of "Post-Assessment Survey" by institute participants.

## APPENDIX D

### SECOND-YEAR CHANGE PROCESS EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS WITH ACCOMPANYING ADMINISTRATION GUIDELINES

- Consultant's Monthly Site Report and Guidelines
- Project Director's Bimonthly Report
- BORN FREE Quarterly Report from Team Leader
- Major BORN FREE Activity Report and Guidelines
- Workshop Evaluation Form
- Evaluator's Site Interview Report and Guidelines
- Evaluation of Project Status
- Project Impact Questionnaire and Cover Letter
- Report of Administration of Project Impact Questionnaire





## Appendix D-1

Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology • Psychoeducational Studies  
College of Education • 139 Burton Hall • 178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.  
University of Minnesota • Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

DIRECTOR L. SUNNY HANSEN 373-0202

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS BEVERLY MILLS-NOVOA, GERRI PERREAULT 373-5558

Build Options, Reassess Norms • Free Roles through Educational Equity

November 1, 1977

TO: Tim Hatfield, Barb Lofgren, and Doug Pelcak, Site Consultants

FROM: Fred Krusemark, Project Evaluator

SUBJECT: Guidelines for Using "Consultant's Monthly Site Reports"

As you know, the "Consultant's Monthly Site Reports" will serve as the primary evaluation strategy to monitor project implementation at each of the fourteen school sites. Because this information is perhaps the most valuable information that could be shared with others developing similar projects, it is critical that this monitoring strategy be as error-free as possible. Thus, in hopes of reducing possible errors, two sets of guidelines are provided below which should assist in ensuring both (1) the validity and/or objectivity of your observations and conclusions (interpretations, inferences and value judgements) and (2) the reliability and/or accuracy of recording these observations and conclusions onto the "Monthly Site Reports." Obviously, these guidelines will be effective only if you have thoroughly read over the guidelines and have internalized them in your consultant activities. Therefore, please read them carefully. If you have any questions, please contact me for clarification.

### Guidelines Concerning Validity/Objectivity of Your Observations and Conclusions

There are several ways you can increase the validity of your observations and conclusions. First, it is essential that you be as directly involved with your site teams as is realistically possible--especially in the planning stages. Obviously, due to your wide span of duties and limited time available, you will not be able to take part in every meeting and activity. However, the more directly involved you are with your site teams, the more direct observations you can make. Also, "first-hand" information is always better than "second-hand" information.

Secondly, because of your limited direct involvement with each of your site teams, you should try to develop (as you probably already have done) some system of getting feedback on a regular basis from each of your sites, e.g., telephone calls, minutes from meetings. To ensure that you are aware of the latest developments at each of your sites, it is suggested that you get feedback from each site on a weekly basis, as a minimum. Obvious exceptions to this would be during vacation and other periods of inactivity.

Besides trying to maximize your level of direct involvement with your sites, and establishing a feedback system, a third way to increase the validity of your observations and conclusions is to use several sources of information which allows you to corroborate your observations and conclusions. For example, your feedback system would ideally involve contacting different team members instead of relying on the same person's perceptions which may be biased and limited in scope. Whenever possible, check out hearsay and indirect information by going to the original sources. This applies not only to "people" sources, but also sources such as memos, reports, and newspaper articles.

Finally, try to use more than one method of collecting information. Possible methods include: interviews (telephone or personal visit) group discussions, surveys, tests, written documents, etc. This strategy is especially important for safeguarding the validity of project results or outcomes since research studies indicate that different measurement methods may influence the apparent outcomes even more than different treatments or activities. Therefore, one should ideally use multiple methods to measure the outcomes of each treatment or activity related to the project.

Unfortunately, there are no fail-safe methods to ensure that your observations and in particular, your conclusions (interpretations, inferences and value judgements) are objective, i.e., unbiased. Nevertheless, this monitoring strategy does assume that because of your professional training to date, you will be able to objectively evaluate the progress and/or problems at each of your sites. Two methods are available which can increase the objectivity of your reports. The first method would be to keep your reports strictly descriptive, i.e., you would report only observations and would not attempt to make any interpretations or inferences. This method would obviously preclude all value judgements. Because the method is nearly impossible to maintain for any prolonged period of time and also because it denies including certain information which may be extremely valuable, this method is not recommended in preparing your reports.

An alternative method to increase the objectivity of your reports is one where you could include interpretations, inferences and even, value judgements. However, this method stipulates that (1) you substantiate your various conclusions with testable, empirical facts; and (2) you make explicit the values behind any value judgements you make. Obviously these stipulations require more effort on your part in preparing reports, but because of these stipulations, this method does not suffer from the severe limitations within the first method. One way you can verify the objectivity of your observations and conclusions is to ask yourself if you could share your reports directly with your site teams. If your response is no, it is possible that your observations or conclusions still lack sufficient empirical evidence or that the values underlying your judgements are not really defensible.

#### Guidelines for Recording Your Observations and Conclusions

Your observations and conclusions related to each of your sites are to be recorded directly onto the "Consultant's Monthly Site Reports." The

"Site Reports" are to be completed on a monthly basis and should be submitted to me (in my box) within the first week of the following month. It is preferred that you type your reports. However, if this is not possible, please be sure that your printing or writing is legible. If you are unable to get all of your remarks concerning a site onto one report form, feel free to use additional forms.

Rather than attempting to recall at the month's end all of your previous observations and conclusions, it is recommended that you use some log system to daily record your observations and conclusions as they occur. If you are not already using some form of daily log, the yellow "Worksheets/Logs for Monthly Site Reports" are available. Since these worksheets use the same format as the "Site Reports," there should be fewer difficulties in transferring your daily observations and conclusions onto the "Site Reports."

In reviewing the "Consultant's Monthly Site Report" you will note that six major categories of information are listed. The first five of the six information categories are related to specific areas of concern. The sixth category, Other Observations and Comments, serves as a "catchall" for any additional remarks which do not apply to any of the five previous categories. Each of these five categories will be separately discussed below concerning the specific information desired under each category. In addition to these information categories, space is provided for the name of the site, month and your signature.

#### I. EXTERNAL SYSTEM CHANGES OR EVENTS AFFECTING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION:

The information requested within this category concerns external system forces (changes and events) that are affecting or may, in the future, affect project implementation at a site. These forces may originate from within the local site/setting or may stem from changes in the overall project plan. Both negative (barriers) and positive (supports) forces should be discussed concerning their differential effects upon the project implementation. Also be sure to include how the site team is adapting or plans to adapt to these impinging forces, e.g., positive forces may cause the team to accelerate their implementation plans and widen the scope of their goals. Examples of possible changes or events include: changes in school personnel or funding, emergence of project-related local issues/problems, local teacher strike, other projects (current and past), new school policies, project evaluation requirements, etc.

#### II. STATUS OF CRITICAL RELATIONSHIPS:

The information requested within this category concerns the status of relationships critical to the success of project implementation at a site. Your report should discuss not only the status of these various relationships, but also the efforts of the site team (and yourself) related to maintaining (improving) these relationships. Critical relationships would include relationships between the team members, your relationship with each team member, relationships between the team and the school staff (especially administrators), and relationships between the team and parents and/or students.



## III. ONGOING AND/OR PLANNED ACTIVITIES:

The information requested within this category concerns both ongoing and planned activities of a site team. "On going" activities refer to regular or continuous activities of a site team, e.g., weekly site team meetings, continuous clarification of project with school staff and soliciting help. All such activities need be discussed briefly, listing dates of meetings/contacts, persons (names or numbers) involved, purpose or content of activity. If any unusual developments occur within these activities, they should be noted also. "Planned" activities, however, refer to major implementation strategies which are focused to specific goals and intended audiences. Because these strategies can be extremely valuable in understanding what is and what is not effective in bringing about change in systems, it is critical that detailed information concerning both the planning and actual implementation of these activities. Because of the severe space limitation of this report, it is recommended that these major implementation strategies be discussed in a separate report, jointly prepared by the site team and yourself. When an activity will be discussed in a separate report, just note the report here and provide a brief summary of the planned activity's parameters: who, what, where, when, how and why.

## IV. SIGNIFICANT OUTCOMES/RESULTS OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES:

The information requested here refers to both expected and unexpected (positive and negative) outcomes/results stemming from previously described site team activities, ongoing and planned. (While a limited discussion of the outcomes of the "planned" activities should be included here, it is recommended that a detailed discussion be included in the forementioned separate report.) In reporting the various outcomes, the methods of measurement should be identified with each outcome. If possible, try to link outcomes with specific causes. e.g., specific persons or learning strategies. You should also attempt to evaluate these outcomes based on either criteria developed by the site team or yourself. Possible outcomes/results include: changes in relevant school policies/procedures; increases (decreases) in desirable (undesirable) behaviors, language, attitudes, knowledge/awareness of school staff, parents and students.

## V. YOUR OVERALL EVALUATION OF SITES PROGRESS TO DATE:

The information requested within this category concerns your overall evaluation of a site team's progress to date. This evaluation should compare a site team's present progress with (1) where the site team (or you) had hoped the team would be at the present time, and (2) the progress to date of your other site teams. Specify the criterion variables used in making these comparisons. Also, if possible, try to make a prognosis concerning the site team's future progress.



Appendix D-1 (continued)

December 5, 1977

To: Barb Lofgren, Tim Hatfield, and Doug Pelcak, Site Consultants  
From: Fred Krusemark, Project Evaluator  
Subject: Additional Suggestions for Using "Consultant's Monthly Site Reports"

As I mentioned in our individual conferences, I was really quite pleased with the quality of your reports--especially in light of the fact that no formal preservice was done with the new report form. However, as you also know, there were a few minor problems in the reports which I hope can be resolved by noting them here as a reminder for future reports. Also, I'd like to make a few additional suggestions which should clarify the original guidelines and, hopefully, should reduce the time needed to write the reports.

There were only two areas of problems encountered in reviewing your reports. The first area concerned incomplete and/or missing information. This area is the most critical of the two because without complete information I cannot write accurate reports of the various implementation activities (and their related problems) in the quarterly and annual reports. The critical information gaps pertain to a) your evaluation (ipsative and/or normative) of each site's progress, b) each site's efforts in dealing with external forces and relationships critical to project implementation, and c) detailed descriptions of each site's activities and outcomes--especially deviations from original plans and unintended side effects. To aid you in recording all important evaluation information, I have substantially increased the space available for your written observations. If there is still not enough space, please feel free to use additional report forms.

The second problem area involved listing information in a section other than the one designated for that certain type of information. While this problem is not as critical as the first and occurred only infrequently, it would be much easier to analyze your reports if the requested information was in the designated section. The most common example of this problem was where various external forces were implied or introduced in later sections of the report without any mention in the section concerned with external changes or events. Another example was where additional information on critical relationships was substituted for the requested information in the section requesting an evaluation of each site's progress.

Hopefully by alerting you to the above problems, they can be minimized in future reports. In addition to citing the problems encountered, I'd like to make five suggestions which should clarify the guidelines and reduce your report writing time. First, review the original guidelines when writing your reports; the guidelines will pinpoint the necessary evaluation information. Second, avoid duplication. There is no need to repeat information already provided in designated section. Third, if both "intra" and "inter" team relationships are in a state of change and require detailed discussion, discuss the former in the "Relationships" section and the latter in the "External Changes/Events" section. Fourth, discussion of "planned" activities can be postponed when there is considerable "ongoing" activities. Finally, try to avoid making/ writing any conclusions which cannot yet be substantiated with facts.



## This image shows a blank white page. There are several small, dark specks scattered across the surface, which appear to be scanning artifacts or dust particles. No text, lines, or other graphical elements are present.

125

CONSULTANT'S MONTHLY SITE REPORT (CON'T)

## This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are some small, dark specks and faint smudges scattered across the surface, particularly near the top and bottom edges, which appear to be dust or minor imperfections on the paper itself. No text or other markings are present.

## This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or printed text on the paper.



Appendix D-2  
PROJECT DIRECTOR'S MONTHLY REPORT

MONTH OF: \_\_\_\_\_

I. EXTERNAL SYSTEM CHANGES OR EVENTS AFFECTING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION:

II. STATUS OF CRITICAL RELATIONSHIPS:

Appendix D-2 (continued)

PROJECT DIRECTOR'S MONTHLY REPORT (CON'T)

MONTH OF: \_\_\_\_\_

III. ONGOING AND/OR PLANNED ACTIVITIES:

IV. SIGNIFICANT OUTCOMES/RESULTS OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES:

Appendix D-2 (continued)  
PROJECT DIRECTOR'S MONTHLY REPORT (CON'T)

MONTH OF: \_\_\_\_\_

V. YOUR EVALUATION OF PROGRESS TO DATE:

VI. OTHER OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS:

BORN FREE  
Quarterly Report  
from Team Leaders

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Please provide the following information on your field site progress for Project BORN FREE management. Your comments will be shared with evaluators and consultants. If there is anything you wish to share which is confidential, please contact me.

Thanks, Sunny Hansen.

1. How would you evaluate your team's progress to date? (in relation to team goals)
2. What have been the major obstacles in getting off the ground this year?
3. What have been the major facilitators of progress in your site this quarter?
4. At this point what is the prognosis for the impact of your team for the rest of the school year?



Appendix D-3 (continued)

5. How do you feel about the way the team is working together?
6. In what areas has the consultant been most helpful?
7. How could the consultant be more helpful?
8. How do you feel the team is working with the rest of the institution?
9. What are the most significant activities or accomplishments of your team this quarter?
10. Other comments (use additional page if necessary).

Build Options,Reassess Norms,Free Roles throughEducational Equity

Person Reporting Activity: \_\_\_\_\_

Field Site: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Title or Brief Description of Activity: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Instructions: Please respond as briefly as possible to the questions listed in the four response sections. Your responses will be treated as confidential, i.e., only the Project Evaluators and the Project Director will have direct access to your activity reports. Any formal analysis will focus on total activities across all 14 Project sites and if specific activities are discussed, no mention will be made of where or who conducted the activities. If you would like a copy of a report sent to a specific source, please note this on the report and a copy will be sent. Please refer to (use) the provided "Completion Guidelines" in filling out your reports.

A. Target Audience/Actual Participants of Activity

1. Who was the intended target audience of the activity and why was this audience selected? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Characteristics of Actual Participants\*

Number Attending \_\_\_\_\_ Attendance Basis (Check): Voluntary \_\_\_\_\_ Required \_\_\_\_\_

Position: Counselors \_\_\_\_\_ Teachers \_\_\_\_\_ Administrators \_\_\_\_\_ Other Staff \_\_\_\_\_

(Non Faculty Position) Parents \_\_\_\_\_ Students \_\_\_\_\_ (Grade Levels \_\_\_\_\_)

Years in Present Faculty Position: Less than 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 to 5 \_\_\_\_\_ Over 6 \_\_\_\_\_

Sex Composition of Participants: Males \_\_\_\_\_ Females \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement/Receptiveness to Project Goals: High \_\_\_\_\_ Average \_\_\_\_\_ Low \_\_\_\_\_

Commitment/Involvement in Career Education: High \_\_\_\_\_ Average \_\_\_\_\_ Low \_\_\_\_\_

\*Except where indicated, list actual or approximate numbers.

3. How did the actual participants differ from the intended target audience with respect to any of the above characteristics? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

1. What were the specific goals of the activity and why were they selected?

- What were the specific goals of the activity and why were they selected?
- What criteria (outcomes) were used to measure if these goals were achieved?

1. Who (names and titles) helped in planning and/or conducting the activity?

2. When (dates and times) was the activity conducted?  

---

---
3. Where (specific location) was the activity conducted?  

---

---
4. Briefly describe both the content (what) and process (how) of the activity?  
(You may wish to attach a copy of the activity outline/plan if available.)

Appendix D-4 (continued)  
REPORT OF MAJOR "BORN FREE" ACTIVITY

C. Implementation of Activity

5. What adaptations were made to the original activity implementation plan and why were they necessary?

D. Evaluation of Activity

1. What evaluation methods did you use to evaluate the activity and why were these methods selected?
2. What did the evaluation indicate about whether or not the goals of the activity were achieved?
3. What did the evaluation indicate about the activity's impact on the participants as a whole, or on any subgroups?
4. What strengths and/or weaknesses concerning the content and process of the activity were identified within the evaluation?
5. Have any unexpected outcomes (negative or positive) been identified in a follow-up evaluation of the activity? If so, specify.



GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETING "REPORT OF MAJOR 'BORN FREE' ACTIVITY"

These guidelines are intended to assist persons in completing the "Report of Major BORN FREE Activity," a report form to be completed for each major implementation activity at the fourteen Project field sites. Within these guidelines the purpose of this report form is explained and completion instructions (general and specific) are also included.

Purpose of the Reports

The primary purpose of these report forms is to get more specific information concerning the major BF activities in the field sites. This information is critical for two reasons. The obvious reason for this information is our need to determine the actual impacts or changes resulting from the activities and the relative effectiveness of each of the various activities implemented. A second reason or need is that we be able to generalize the use of activities to other appropriate settings or audiences and that we can identify certain crucial factors or processes both within the activities and external to the activities (e.g., audience characteristics) which can significantly influence the actual impacts or changes resulting from the activities.

A secondary purpose of these report forms is to provide field site teams with a structure or format that can assist them in analyzing past activities and, more importantly, a structure which can be used in planning future activities. In this sense, these reports can be used as both evaluation and planning tools. They are intended to meet your own local needs as well as the Project's evaluation needs.

General Instructions

Presently, both Consultants and field site Team Leaders will share responsibility for these "activity report forms." The Consultants are responsible for submitting reports for past activities that have not yet already been reported on while the Team Leaders are responsible for ensuring that activity report forms are submitted for all ongoing and future major implementation activities in their respective field sites. If appropriate, a Team Leader may choose to delegate the task of preparing the report to another (e.g., the person who had major responsibility for the activity). Because similar activities may have differing planned impacts (very significant vs. minor) in different field sites, it is not possible to clearly define what is a "major" activity other than to state that the activity be one considered as an end in itself - not strictly a means or prelude for another activity. Activities that are neither ends in themselves nor major thrusts in a field site's implementation plan need not be reported on. A continuing series of related activities, all of which comprise a major thrust, would be considered as a single activity and would require only one report to be submitted at the end of the series. Our expectations concerning the number of reports to be received is that throughout the entire school year each field site will conduct from 3 to 7 major implementation activities which will require reports.

Activity report forms should be prepared as soon as possible after the completion of each major activity. Unless a formal follow-up evaluation is planned for an activity and you wish to delay the report until the results are collected, any informal follow-up evaluation results can be discussed in your Quarterly Progress Reports or relayed to the Consultants for inclusion in their reports.

#### Appendix D-4 (continued)

Depending on the number of participants for a given activity, you may or may not wish to hand tabulate the "Workshop Evaluation Forms" completed by the activity participants and include the results in your report. If an activity has several participants, you may wish to submit the evaluation forms (unanalyzed) with your activity report form and we will computer analyze the participant evaluation forms and return the results to you. If you do choose to hand tabulate the evaluation forms, please return the evaluation forms with your activity reports.

Once an activity report has been prepared, it (the original) along with the evaluation forms (if not already given to the Consultants) should be mailed to BORN FREE main office and addressed to: Project Evaluators--no specific name is necessary. Your reports, as well as all other evaluation data relevant to your field site, will be treated as confidential, i.e., no persons other than the Project Evaluators and Director will have direct access to your evaluation data. Any formal analysis of this data will probably pool together the evaluation data from all field sites and if individual activities should be used as examples, where or who conducted these activities will not be identified. While we will not share your evaluation data with unauthorized persons, we can send a copy of your reports or our analysis to persons whom you would like to receive a copy.

#### Specific Instructions

These activity reports request certain specific information which is to be written directly on the the report forms. If additional space is necessary in responding to any question, space is available on the back of the second sheet. In using this additional space, please clearly indicate the section and question to which your remarks apply (e.g., A.1 This audience was selected because...). Because the available space for your remarks is limited, you may wish to first write your responses on another sheet and then transfer them (in a more concise form) to the report form. Please write or print as legibly as possible.

While there is some limited information requested at the top of the activity report form, most of the requested information lies within the four sections below:

- A. Target Audience/Actual Participants of Activity;
- B. Goals and Purpose of Activity;
- C. Implementation of Activity; and
- D. Evaluation of Activity.

Each of these four section will be briefly discussed regarding the specific information requested within each section.

Target Audience/Actual Participants of Activity In this section information is requested on both the intended target audience of an activity and the actual participants. The first question requests a brief description of the intended audience and also why this audience was selected. The second question requests information about the characteristics of the actual participants. While it is possible to get exact breakdowns on certain characteristics, it is recognized that only estimates may be possible for other characteristics--the workshop evaluation form could provide most information. The last question requests information on how the actual participants differ from the intended audience on the above characteristics.

#### Appendix D-4 (continued)

Goals and Purposes of Activity In this section information is requested concerning the goals and purposes of the activity. The first question asks about the specific goals (objectives) of the activity and also why these goals or objectives were selected over other possible ones. The second question requests information on what criteria (outcomes) were used to measure whether or not the objectives were achieved. These criteria can be expected levels or changes in attitudes/values, knowledge/skills, behavior (verbal and nonverbal) and system policies or procedures.

Implementation of Activity In this section information is requested about the actual implementation of the activity. The first three questions concern: (1) Who (names and titles) planned and/or conducted the activity? (2) When (dates and times) was the activity conducted? and (3) Where (specific locations) was the activity conducted? The fourth question requested a detailed description of both the content (what) and process (how) of the activity. To supplement this description, an outline or schedule of the actual implementation of the activity should be attached if available. The fifth question inquires about adaptations of the original activity plan. Besides noting any adaptations or modifications of the plan, please identify the factors necessitating these changes.

Evaluation of Activity In this section information is requested concerning how the activity was evaluated and the results of the evaluation. The first question asks what methods were used to evaluate the activity--participant evaluation forms, formal or informal interviews, monitoring for expected changes in participants or system. The methods used will obviously depend the activity objectives and the expected outcomes relative to these objectives. The second question asks for information on whether or not the goals/objectives of the activity were achieved. The third question requested information about the activity's impact on the participants as a whole or on smaller subgroups--the participants' workshop evaluation form could provide information on different subgroups. The fourth question requests information on the strengths and/or weaknesses of the activity in an attempt to pinpoint why the activity goals/objectives were or were not achieved. This question addresses both content and process. The fifth question asks about any unexpected impacts or outcomes (negative and positive) of the activity. These unexpected impacts could be ones that are immediately apparent or ones that are not noticeable until some time after the activity.



Project BORII FREE  
Workshop Evaluation Form

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ (optional)

If educator (circle) Teacher Counselor Administrator Other  
(circle) Elementary Secondary Higher Education/Post-secondary

Sex (circle) Female Male Parent (circle) Yes No

Student (circle) Yes No Grade level \_\_\_\_\_

Age (circle) under 17 18-22 23-29 30-32 33-39 40-45 46-55 56+

Please circle only one number per question unless otherwise indicated.

1. I have had training, coursework, or experience where I have learned the concepts of career development education.

none at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 quite a lot

2. I feel that sex-role stereotyping limits career options for both men and women.

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 extremely

3. The workshop site was appealing, attractive, and well located. I felt comfortable in these surroundings.

quite poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 superior

4. The workshop was well organized (i.e. agenda, activities, presentations, time, breaks etc).

very poorly organized 1 2 3 4 5 6 extremely well organized

5. The goals of this workshop were very clear.

not clear at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 extremely clear

6. In my opinion, the overall goals of the workshop were accomplished, and this workshop met my expectations.

no goals accomplished 1 2 3 4 5 6 all goals fully accomplished

7. In general, I felt that the workshop climate was open, trusting, and that information flowed freely among the participants.

almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 almost always

8. I felt that when I had a contribution to make, I had an opportunity to make it.

almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 almost always

9. I felt that the content and activities were interesting.

almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 almost always



Appendix D-5 (continued)

10. The presenters were knowledgeable and competent.  
not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 superior

11. The presenters were warm and communicative.  
not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 extremely so

12. Please rate the following if appropriate.

|                                         | very poor |   |   |   |   | extremely well done |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------|---|---|---|---|---------------------|
| main presentation/lecture               | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6                   |
| group exercises (learning strategies)   | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6                   |
| video tape sessions                     | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6                   |
| small group discussions                 | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6                   |
| films, tapes, and other media           | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6                   |
| informal individual or group discussion | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6                   |
| coffee breaks, lunch/dinner             | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6                   |
| panel discussion or other activities    | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6                   |
| time allotted each was appropriate      | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6                   |

13. Please rank the following in terms of its overall importance to accomplishing the goals of this workshop. Rank only activities used in this workshop. (1=highest, 8=lowest)

- \_\_\_\_\_ main presentation/lecture
- \_\_\_\_\_ group exercises (learning strategies)
- \_\_\_\_\_ video tape sessions
- \_\_\_\_\_ small group discussions
- \_\_\_\_\_ films, tapes, and other media
- \_\_\_\_\_ informal individual or group discussion
- \_\_\_\_\_ coffee breaks, lunch or dinner
- \_\_\_\_\_ panel discussion and other activities

14. I feel free to call upon the Project BORN FREE staff in my institution for assistance, resources, or general follow-up.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

15. I accepted the goals of this workshop.

did not accept 1 2 3 4 5 6 fully accepted

16. Even though I may have accepted the goals, values, or concepts of the BORN FREE Project at an intellectual level, I probably won't try to implement changes in my institution.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

17. This workshop will probably have a significant impact on my attitudes or behaviors.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

18. For me, the most important aspect of the workshop was:

19. The one thing about this workshop that troubled me and was the least satisfying was:

20. Workshop evaluation forms are boring and a waste of time.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

Person Reporting Activity: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Report: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: \_\_\_\_\_ Interview Time: \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

## This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are some small, dark specks and faint smudges scattered across the surface, particularly near the top edge, which might be dust or imperfections from the scanning process. The overall appearance is that of a clean, unused piece of stationery.

140

## Appendix D-6 (continued)

### III. ONGOING AND PLANNED MAJOR ACTIVITIES

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are some small, dark specks and faint smudges scattered across the surface, particularly near the top and bottom edges, which appear to be artifacts from the scanning process or dust on the original paper. No text or other markings are present on the page.

#### IV. SIGNIFICANT OUTCOMES/RESULTS OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

11

V. YOUR EVALUATION OF SITE'S PROGRESS TO DATE

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or printed text on the paper. A small, dark smudge is visible near the top center, and some faint, irregular marks are present towards the bottom right corner.

142



February 6, 1978

To: Sue Warsett and Phil Penn  
From: Fred Krusemark  
Subj: Guidelines for Conducting Site Interviews and Completing "Evaluator's Site Interview Reports."

As you know we are now responsible for conducting interviews at the various field sites as assigned below:

Sue Warsett - Harley Hopkins Elementary, North Junior High, Eisenhower Senior High, Normandale Community College and Augsburg College  
Phil Penn - Webster Elementary, Mounds Park Junior High and Washington Senior High  
Fred Krusemark - Lincoln Elementary, Sunrise Park Junior High, Mariner Senior High, Lakewood Community College, 916 Vo-Tech, and CLA (U of M)

The primary reason for conducting these interviews is to supplement our other "change-process" evaluation strategies, i.e., to verify evaluation data from the other strategies and where necessary, fill any information gaps not covered by the other evaluation strategies. Because the data from these interviews will be used to corroborate the other change-process evaluation data (e.g., the Consultant's Monthly Site Reports), it is important that the interview data be as methodologically clean as possible. Hence, I am writing these guidelines to assist you in both (1) conducting your site interviews, and (2) writing your site-interview reports. In addition to reviewing these guidelines, you should also review the various attachments to which the guidelines refer:

1. Bouchard's Field Research Methods (the section on "the research interview.")
2. Change-Process Evaluation in this year's First Quarterly Report (p. 26-31)
3. Guidelines for Using "Consultant's Monthly Site Reports."
4. Guidelines for Completing "Report of Major BORN FREE Activity."

#### Preparing for and Conducting the Site Interviews

Before going to specific suggestions concerning how to prepare for and to conduct the site interviews, three general points about the interviews should be made even though they were already discussed informally. First, while it was originally suggested that each field site be interviewed on a monthly basis, as it now stands,

two interviews over a three month period (e.g., Feb. - Apr.) with each field site will be sufficient. Second, the interview is to be a "one to one" interview which is not expected to exceed one hour in length. The person (team member) to be interviewed will differ each interview in the hopes that this rotation will ensure that all team members' perceptions will be included so as to minimize any blind spots or idiosyncratic biases of individuals.

Third, the format of the site interviews can be described as "semi-structured" in that while there are certain areas of concern that are to be covered within the site interviews (see "Evaluator's Site Interview Report"), it is the responsibility of the interviewer to develop in advance of each interview a list of specific questions which are most appropriate for that particular interview. The reasons for this "semi-structured" approach as opposed to a "completely structured" approach are several. First, given that the primary reason for the site interviews is to supplement and corroborate the data from other change-process evaluation strategies, it only makes sense that the specific interview questions stem from the available data on the field site from the other change-process evaluation strategies. Second, in light of the considerable differences between various field sites, one could best achieve and maintain rapport with interviewees by selecting only questions relevant to each field site's current implementation status and by wording or phrasing questions to fit each interviewee. Certain important questions may even have to be eliminated because an interviewee is not in a position to answer the questions. Much research on interviewing indicates that standardized questions can alienate respondents and do not necessarily guarantee standardized (reliable) responses. Third, because of the obvious time limitations of a one hour interview, it is not possible to ask all potentially interesting evaluation questions. Thus, a smaller sample of questions must be selected in advance.

Preparing for Interviews In order to maximize the probabilities that the site interviews will provide us with the most useful information possible, there are several things you should do prior to the actual interview. In setting up the interview with the person to be interviewed, be sure to thoroughly explain the purpose of the interviews and the fact that all team members will be interviewed. Also clearly explain what is expected of the interviewee (e.g., one hour of private time) and try to minimize any status differentials which could substantially lower trust levels and therefore the productivity of the interview. If the actual interview is scheduled a week or two after your initial contact, you may want to contact the interviewee a day before the interview as a reminder.

Prior to the interview, you will need to develop a list of questions to ask in the interview. As indicated above your questions should stem from information already collected on a field site. Because the "Consultant's Monthly Site Reports" provide the most detailed information on each field site, these reports should be your primary source of information. In addition to this source, "Team Leader Quarterly Progress Reports" are available for some field sites for last quarter, and there are written reports for most major activities undertaken at each field site. You may also wish to discuss the current implementation status of a field site with the consultant for that field site. You should also read written guidelines for these various reports since these guidelines indicate specific questions that the various reports are intended to address and would thus identify specific questions you may want to include in an interview.

Another source to use in generating specific questions is the "Change-Process Evaluation" section in this year's first quarterly report. Within this section, certain internal and external factors influencing project implementation at various field sites are identified and can be easily transformed into questions. The format of the "Evaluator's Site Interview Report" is essentially the same as the format of the "Consultant's Monthly Site Report," however, the format was changed slightly to include the factors identified in the first quarterly report.

Finally, as Bouchard suggests, be sure that the questions you select are very direct and clear--ambiguous or unclear questions can generate anxiety and distrust on the part of interviewees. Bouchard also suggests that within each major area of concern (headings on Interview Report), the broadest and most open questions be listed first, leaving the more specific questions with fixed response formats (e.g., yes/no) for later in the interview. These "funnel" sequences should provide you with several advantages that Bouchard notes.

Conducting the Interviews If the interviews are to start off on the right key, you should be sure to arrive at the interview on time or a little early. If you are going to be late (even a few minutes), you may want to call and reschedule the interview. In the actual interview, it is essential that you maintain an "inquiry" stance. Such a stance would communicate that you are there only to collect and/or verify specific information, not to judge the information or the person giving the information. In asking questions, phrase the questions as neutrally as possible and if sensitive areas come up, try to maintain your neutrality and avoid taking sides. You are there as an honest inquirer, not as a messenger or representative. Should an interviewee start to share personal information not to be used for the record or discussed with others, you may want to reclarify the purpose of the interview, i.e., to collect information that can be used for evaluative purposes, and indicate that the information because of its personal nature not be discussed within the interview.

There are several other "should's" and "should not's" on interviewing which will not be repeated here since they are clearly discussed in Bouchard's article. It should be obvious all of the suggestions above reflect the bottom line in good interviewing which is: Building and maintaining a good rapport with the interviewee -- without this rapport the value of the interviews will be substantially lowered.

#### Writing Your Site Interview Reports

While there is intentionally no standardized list of questions to use at all interviews, there is a standardized report form to be completed for each site interview. These interview reports should be prepared as soon as possible after the completion of an interview -- especially if no notes are taken during an interview. Once you have prepared a report, you can submit it to me immediately or submit it with the other interview reports at the end of a given month. Because the available space for your comments is limited, you may want to first write your comments on another sheet and then transfer them to the report form.

The format of the "Evaluator's Site Interview Report" is very similar to the format of the other reports. A limited amount of information is requested at the top of the report form while most of the information requested in the report falls under major sections or headings. Because the sections or headings in



the interview report are very similar to the sections in the "Consultant's Monthly Site Reports" which have been discussed at length (see guidelines for these reports), the discussion here will be limited to areas where the content of the reports differ, i.e., this discussion is a supplement to the other discussion which needs to be reviewed.

#### I. PROJECT OR INSTITUTIONAL PRESSURES OR EVENTS AFFECTING FIELD SITE IMPLEMENTATION

This section differs somewhat from the equivalent section in the Consultant's report in that it has been expanded to include certain "Project" (only forces originating from the University) and "Institutional" or "Non-Project" factors identified in the first quarterly report as affecting field site implementation progress. To determine which of these 10 factors are currently operating at a field site and need to be discussed in the interview and the report, review the current consultant's reports for each field site.

#### II. STATUS OF TEAM RELATIONSHIPS AND FUNCTIONING

As above, this section has been expanded to include certain "Project" (team functioning) factors also identified in the quarterly report you will also need to determine which of these 3 factors are relevant for a field site and need to be discussed.

#### III. ONGOING AND PLANNED MAJOR ACTIVITIES

This section is essentially the same as the equivalent section in the Consultant's report, the title has just been modified to better distinguish between ongoing and planned activities. For specific questions to ask about planned activities, see "Report of Major BORN FREE Activity" and the attached guidelines.

#### IV. SIGNIFICANT OUTCOMES/RESULTS OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

(Same as III.)

#### V. YOUR EVALUATION OF SITE'S PROGRESS TO DATE

This section is identical to the equivalent section in the Consultant's report. While your evaluation of a field site's progress to date could be helpful, it is very likely that you would have insufficient data to make such an assessment. In addition to listing your assessment here, you should note here the interviewee's assessment of field site progress and the reasons for this assessment.

#### VI. OTHER OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

This section is intended as a "catch-all" for any other comments you wish to make concerning the interview. You may wish to use the section to discuss the interview process itself -- especially if unexpected difficulties were encountered.



Appendix D-7

Evaluation of Project Status

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

- I. Please describe your personal commitment to Project BORN FREE at this time.
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- II. In personally implementing project goals for the rest of this year,
  - A. What are your greatest facilitators?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  - B. What are your greatest inhibitors?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- III. When thinking about your institution's continuing the work of Project BORN FREE after University support is no longer available,
  - A. What are the greatest facilitators?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  - B. What are the greatest inhibitors?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- IV. What have been the most important outcomes of today's meeting for you?

Sample Cover Letter for Project Impact Questionnaire

P  
Date

To: All faculty and staff members  
From: Principal/President  
Re: Evaluation of Project BORN FREE

Attached is an evaluation questionnaire which I am asking that you complete and return to me/specified team member by \_\_\_\_\_. This questionnaire concerns a project that our institution has been cooperating with for the past two years. Your responses are very important and will be used in determining the overall impact of the project at our institution. Please respond as candidly as possible. When I receive a report of the analysis of the questionnaire data, I will be happy to share this report with any interested faculty or staff.

Thanks for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire.

Appendix D-8 (continued)  
PROJECT IMPACT QUESTIONNAIRE

No. \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

Please complete the following:

Name of Your Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Your Job Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Sex: Female \_\_\_\_\_ Male \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

Please respond to the following questions by checking "Yes," "No" or "Unsure."

Where indicated, please write in examples of attitude or behavior change resulting from the project.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Unsure</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                                   | _____      | _____     | _____         |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                                            | _____      | _____     | _____         |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                                         | _____      | _____     | _____         |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                                     | _____      | _____     | _____         |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using project materials with students)                          | _____      | _____     | _____         |
| 6. As a result of the project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                                                | _____      | _____     | _____         |
| 7. Has the project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?<br>Example: _____                                                                       | _____      | _____     | _____         |
| 8. As a result of the project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?<br>Example: _____                                                                 | _____      | _____     | _____         |
| 9. Has the project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?<br>Example: _____                                                                                   | _____      | _____     | _____         |
| 10. As a result of the project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options?<br>Example: _____ | _____      | _____     | _____         |
| 11. Do you feel that the project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                                       | _____      | _____     | _____         |

COMMENTS: 11)  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix D-2 (continued)

Dear Faculty/Staff Member:

For the past two years, your institution, along with thirteen other educational institutions (elementary, secondary, and postsecondary/higher education), has participated in a major federal project (Project BORN FREE) which is developing transportable training materials and procedures which educators at all levels can use to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping. A major focus of the project has been on examining the relationship between sex-role socialization and career socialization, and on creating interventions through which educational institutions can (a) examine and modify those practices that inhibit career development and limit options and (b) identify and adapt those practices that facilitate career development.

Because the project is now coming to the end of its formal activities, it is important to obtain evaluation information concerning the actual impacts or changes that the project has made in your institution. Your responses to the questions on this survey are extremely valuable. Please respond as candidly as possible and feel free to write any comments you have in the space provided. Your individual responses will be treated as strictly confidential. Thanks!



Appendix D-9  
REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF PROJECT IMPACT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of Person Completing Report: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Report: \_\_\_\_\_ Name of Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

1. Who have been the BORN FREE target audiences at your institution?

\_\_\_\_\_ all faculty    selected faculty \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ all support staff    selected support staff \_\_\_\_\_ (specify)

\_\_\_\_\_ (specify)

2. Total number of persons in BORN FREE target audiences: \_\_\_\_\_

3. The Project Impact Questionnaire was administered to:

\_\_\_\_\_ all persons in target audiences

\_\_\_\_\_ random sample of persons in target audiences

\_\_\_\_\_ nonrandomized sample of persons in target audience

other \_\_\_\_\_  
(specify)

4. Total number of persons receiving Project Impact Questionnaire: \_\_\_\_\_

5. Total number of persons returning Project Impact Questionnaire: \_\_\_\_\_

6. How and by whom was the Project Impact Questionnaire administered?  
(If a cover letter was used, please attach.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. How and to whom were the completed questionnaires returned?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

8. What follow-up efforts were used to obtain the requested 90% response rate?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

9. What problems were encountered in administering the questionnaires and collecting the returns?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

10. Were any external factors operating at the time of the questionnaire administration that may have biased (positively or negatively) the responses received?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX E

### SUPPLEMENTAL CHANGE PROCESS EVALUATION DATA TABLES

|            |                                                                                                                          |
|------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Table E-1  | Carson Elementary School Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                      |
| Table E-2  | Norwood Elementary School Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                     |
| Table E-3  | Glenwood Elementary School Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                    |
| Table E-4  | Middleton Junior High School Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                  |
| Table E-5  | Linden Junior High School Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                     |
| Table E-6  | Valley View Junior High School Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                |
| Table E-7  | Morningside Senior High School Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                |
| Table E-8  | Central Senior High School Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                    |
| Table E-9  | Parkside College Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                              |
| Table E-10 | Midwestern University Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                         |
| Table E-11 | Northtown Community College Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                   |
| Table E-12 | West City Community College Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                   |
| Table E-13 | Breakdown of Project Impact Questionnaire Respondents by "Status" for Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)                |
| Table E-14 | Breakdown of Project Impact Questionnaire Respondents by "Sex" for Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)                   |
| Table E-15 | Breakdown of Project Impact Questionnaire Respondents by "Occupational Position" for Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels) |
| Table E-16 | Total (All Sites) BORN FREE Team Member Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                       |
| Table E-17 | Total (All Sites) Female Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                      |
| Table E-18 | Total (All Sites) Male Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                        |
| Table E-19 | Total (All Sites) Teacher Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)                                     |

## APPENDIX E (continued)

- Table E-20 Total (All Sites) Administrator Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)
- Table E-21 Total (All Sites) Counselor/Student Personnel Worker Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)
- Table E-22 Summary of Correlations Between Total (All Sites) Responses to Questions on Project Impact Questionnaire
- Table E-23 Comments by Questionnaire Respondents at Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)
- Guide for Tables E-24 to E-27
- Table E-24 Summary of Correlations Between Change Process Variables: Project Characteristics With Project, Institutional, Team and Implementation Characteristics
- Table E-25 Summary of Correlations Between Change Process Variables: Institutional Characteristics With Institutional, Team, and Implementation Characteristics
- Table E-26 Summary of Correlations Between Change Process Variables: Team Characteristics With Team and Implementation Characteristics
- Table E-27 Summary of Correlations Between Change Process Variables: Implementation Characteristics With Implementation Characteristics
- Table E-28 Summary of Correlations Between Change Process Variables: Project, Institutional, Team, and Implementation Characteristics and Total (All Sites) Responses on Project Impact Questionnaire

Table E-1  
Carson Elementary School Responses to Project  
Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |       |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes   | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 0                              | 0      | 100.0 | 0     |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 0                              | 0      | 93.3  | 6.7   |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 0                              | 0      | 100.0 | 0     |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 20.0                           | 0      | 73.3  | 6.7   |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 26.7                           | 0      | 66.7  | 6.7   |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 0                              | 0      | 100.0 | 0     |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 0                              | 26.7   | 73.3  | 0     |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 0                              | 66.7   | 33.3  | 0     |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 0                              | 73.3   | 26.7  | 0     |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 6.7                            | 66.7   | 26.7  | 0     |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 0                              | 6.7    | 86.7  | 6.7   |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 15.



Table E-2  
Norwood Elementary School Responses to Project  
Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 44.4                           | 27.8   | 27.8 | 0     |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 5.6                            | 11.1   | 83.3 | 0     |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 0                              | 5.6    | 94.4 | 0     |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 11.1                           | 0      | 88.9 | 0     |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 83.3                           | 5.6    | 11.1 | 0     |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 22.2                           | 11.1   | 61.1 | 5.6   |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 27.8                           | 38.9   | 27.8 | 5.6   |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 5.6                            | 88.9   | 5.6  | 0     |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 5.6                            | 83.3   | 11.1 | 0     |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 0                              | 88.9   | 11.1 | 0     |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 5.6                            | 11.1   | 77.8 | 5.6   |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 18.

Table E-3  
Glenwood Elementary School Responses to Project  
Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |       |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes   | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 23.8                           | 9.5    | 66.7  | 0     |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 4.8                            | 23.8   | 71.4  | 0     |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 0                              | 0      | 100.0 | 0     |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 14.3                           | 0      | 85.7  | 0     |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 38.1                           | 4.8    | 57.1  | 0     |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 14.3                           | 19.0   | 66.7  | 0     |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 33.3                           | 19.0   | 47.6  | 0     |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 23.8                           | 71.4   | 4.8   | 0     |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 4.8                            | 81.0   | 9.5   | 4.8   |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 0                              | 71.0   | 23.8  | 4.8   |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 14.3                           | 23.8   | 57.1  | 4.8   |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 21.

Table E-4  
Middleton Junior High School Responses to Project  
Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 21.6                           | 15.7   | 60.8 | 2.0   |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 7.8                            | 7.8    | 84.3 | 0     |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 7.8                            | 13.7   | 76.5 | 2.0   |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 25.5                           | 3.9    | 70.6 | 0     |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 78.4                           | 2.0    | 19.6 | 0     |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 27.5                           | 11.8   | 60.8 | 0     |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 35.3                           | 9.8    | 51.0 | 3.9   |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 13.7                           | 66.7   | 17.6 | 2.0   |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 5.9                            | 78.4   | 15.7 | 0     |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 5.9                            | 62.7   | 27.5 | 3.9   |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 9.8                            | 29.4   | 60.8 | 0     |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 51.

Table E-5  
Linden Junior High School Responses to Project  
Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 31.3                           | 18.8   | 46.9 | 3.1   |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 9.4                            | 0      | 87.5 | 3.1   |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 3.1                            | 15.6   | 75.0 | 6.3   |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 25.0                           | 0      | 68.8 | 6.3   |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 84.4                           | 6.3    | 9.4  | 0     |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 37.5                           | 21.9   | 37.5 | 3.1   |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 37.5                           | 31.3   | 28.1 | 3.1   |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 3.1                            | 75.0   | 18.8 | 3.1   |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 6.3                            | 71.9   | 18.8 | 3.1   |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 3.1                            | 59.4   | 31.3 | 6.3   |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 9.4                            | 28.1   | 56.3 | 6.3   |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 32.



Table E-6  
Valley View Junior High School Responses to Project  
Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 45.8                           | 10.4   | 41.7 | 2.1   |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 18.8                           | 16.7   | 62.5 | 2.1   |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 2.1                            | 0      | 97.9 | 0     |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 10.4                           | 0      | 89.6 | 0     |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 77.1                           | 2.1    | 20.8 | 0     |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 35.4                           | 20.8   | 39.6 | 4.2   |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 45.8                           | 25.0   | 29.2 | 0     |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 33.3                           | 56.3   | 8.3  | 2.1   |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 20.8                           | 75.0   | 4.2  | 0     |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 8.3                            | 66.7   | 22.9 | 2.1   |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 47.9                           | 22.9   | 27.1 | 2.1   |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 48.

Table E-7  
Morningside Senior High School Responses to Project  
Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 27.6                           | 17.2   | 51.7 | 3.4   |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 3.4                            | 6.9    | 89.7 | 0     |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 0                              | 10.3   | 86.2 | 3.4   |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 58.6                           | 0      | 41.4 | 0     |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 75.9                           | 3.4    | 20.7 | 0     |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 31.0                           | 13.8   | 51.7 | 3.4   |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 37.9                           | 24.1   | 31.0 | 6.9   |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 24.1                           | 58.6   | 13.8 | 3.4   |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 17.2                           | 55.2   | 24.1 | 3.4   |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 13.8                           | 69.0   | 13.8 | 3.4   |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 13.8                           | 20.7   | 62.1 | 3.4   |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 29.

Table E-8  
Central Senior High School Responses to Project  
Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 33.3                           | 10.6   | 54.5 | 1.5   |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 4.5                            | 10.6   | 83.3 | 1.5   |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 9.1                            | 10.6   | 74.2 | 6.1   |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 16.7                           | 1.5    | 80.3 | 1.5   |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 89.4                           | 0      | 10.6 | 0     |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 39.4                           | 4.5    | 54.5 | 1.5   |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 54.5                           | 15.2   | 27.3 | 3.0   |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 22.7                           | 66.7   | 7.6  | 3.0   |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 25.8                           | 63.6   | 6.1  | 4.5   |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 25.8                           | 57.6   | 16.7 | 0     |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 27.3                           | 18.2   | 53.0 | 1.5   |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 66.

Table E-9  
Parkside College Responses to Project  
Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |       |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes   | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 5.6                            | 0      | 83.3  | 11.1  |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 5.6                            | 0      | 94.4  | 0     |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 0                              | 0      | 100.0 | 0     |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 0                              | 0      | 100.0 | 0     |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 33.3                           | 0      | 66.7  | 0     |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 44.4                           | 11.1   | 38.9  | 5.6   |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 44.4                           | 16.7   | 27.8  | 11.1  |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 27.8                           | 61.1   | 5.6   | 5.6   |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 22.2                           | 61.1   | 11.1  | 5.6   |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 22.2                           | 38.9   | 22.2  | 16.7  |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 0                              | 5.6    | 94.4  | 0     |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 18.



Table E-10  
Midwestern University Responses to Project  
Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 9.5                            | 7.1    | 83.3 | 0     |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 0                              | 2.4    | 97.6 | 0     |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 4.8                            | 7.1    | 76.2 | 11.9  |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 69.0                           | 0      | 31.0 | 0     |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 85.7                           | 0      | 14.3 | 0     |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 50.0                           | 9.5    | 28.6 | 11.9  |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 50.0                           | 14.3   | 19.0 | 16.7  |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 11.9                           | 69.0   | 7.1  | 11.9  |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 11.9                           | 73.8   | 2.4  | 11.9  |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 19.0                           | 66.7   | 2.4  | 11.9  |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 2.4                            | 21.4   | 71.4 | 4.8   |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 42.

Table E-11  
Northtown Community College Responses to Project  
Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 25.0                           | 8.3    | 66.7 | 0     |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 4.2                            | 8.3    | 87.5 | 0     |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 41.7                           | 0      | 54.2 | 4.2   |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 66.7                           | 4.2    | 25.0 | 4.2   |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 75.0                           | 4.2    | 16.7 | 4.2   |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 45.8                           | 4.2    | 29.2 | 20.8  |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 45.8                           | 20.8   | 12.5 | 20.8  |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 16.7                           | 54.2   | 8.3  | 20.8  |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 16.7                           | 66.7   | 0    | 16.7  |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 8.3                            | 50.0   | 20.8 | 20.8  |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 0                              | 29.2   | 58.3 | 12.5  |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 24.

Table E-12  
West City Community College Responses to Project  
Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 18.2                           | 15.2   | 63.6 | 3.0   |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 6.1                            | 12.1   | 81.8 | 0     |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 9.1                            | 6.1    | 84.8 | 0     |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 25.8                           | 3.0    | 71.2 | 0     |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 69.7                           | 3.0    | 25.8 | 1.5   |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 30.3                           | 7.6    | 59.1 | 3.0   |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 33.3                           | 9.1    | 50.0 | 7.6   |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 16.7                           | 51.5   | 25.8 | 6.1   |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 13.6                           | 71.2   | 7.6  | 7.6   |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 13.6                           | 57.6   | 24.2 | 4.5   |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 4.5                            | 24.2   | 68.2 | 3.0   |

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 66.

Table E-13

Breakdown of Project Impact Questionnaire Respondents  
by "Status" for Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)

| Level<br>Site                             | Status      |           |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|
|                                           | Team Member | Nonmember |
| Elementary                                |             |           |
| Carson                                    | 4           | 15        |
| Norwood                                   | -           | 8         |
| Glenwood                                  | 6           | 21        |
| Junior High                               |             |           |
| Middleton                                 | 6           | 51        |
| Linden                                    | 5           | 32        |
| Valley View                               | 3           | 48        |
| Senior High                               |             |           |
| Morningside                               | 3           | 29        |
| Bellevue <sup>a</sup>                     | NA          | NA        |
| Central                                   | 1           | 66        |
| Postsecondary                             |             |           |
| Parkside College                          | 3           | 18        |
| Midwestern University                     | 1           | 42        |
| West City Community College               | 3           | 66        |
| Northtown Community College               | 1           | 24        |
| Oak Creek Vo.Tech. Institute <sup>a</sup> | NA          | NA        |
|                                           | 36          | 430       |

<sup>a</sup>Questionnaire was not administered (NA) at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech.



Table E-14

Breakdown of Project Impact Questionnaire Respondents  
by "Sex" for Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)

| Level<br>Site                | Sex <sup>a</sup> |       |
|------------------------------|------------------|-------|
|                              | Females          | Males |
| Elementary                   |                  |       |
| Carson                       | 16               | 3     |
| Norwood                      | 12               | 5     |
| Glenwood                     | 20               | 7     |
| Junior High                  |                  |       |
| Middleton                    | 23               | 29    |
| Linden                       | 19               | 18    |
| Valley View                  | 20               | 30    |
| Senior High                  |                  |       |
| Morningside                  | 19               | 12    |
| Bellevue                     | NA               | NA    |
| Central                      | 25               | 39    |
| Postsecondary                |                  |       |
| Parkside College             | 14               | 7     |
| Midwestern University        | 27               | 14    |
| West City Community College  | 32               | 37    |
| Northtown Community College  | 12               | 11    |
| Oak Creek Vo.Tech. Institute | NA               | NA    |
|                              | 239              | 212   |

Note. Questionnaire not administered (NA) at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech.

<sup>a</sup>Across sites, 15 respondents did not indicate their sex.

Table E-15  
Breakdown of Project Impact Questionnaire Respondents  
by "Occupational Position" for Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)

| Level         | Occupational Position <sup>a</sup> |                             |           |            |                 |       |
|---------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|-------|
|               | Site                               | Admin. Teacher <sup>b</sup> | Counselor | Specialist | Clerk<br>Typist | Other |
| Elementary    |                                    |                             |           |            |                 |       |
|               | Carson                             | - 15                        | 1         | 2          | -               | -     |
|               | Norwood                            | - 16                        | -         | 1          | -               | -     |
|               | Glenwood                           | 2 20                        | -         | 3          | -               | -     |
| Junior High   |                                    |                             |           |            |                 |       |
|               | Middleton                          | 3 45                        | 4         | 2          | 1               | -     |
|               | Linden                             | 2 30                        | 4         | 1          | -               | -     |
|               | Valley View                        | 2 43                        | 3         | 1          | 1               | -     |
| Senior High   |                                    |                             |           |            |                 |       |
|               | Morningside                        | 4 19                        | 1         | 1          | 3               | 2     |
|               | Bellevue                           | NA NA                       | NA        | NA         | NA              | NA    |
|               | Central                            | 2 57                        | 4         | 3          | -               | -     |
| Postsecondary |                                    |                             |           |            |                 |       |
|               | Parkside College                   | 5 8                         | 5         | 1          | -               | -     |
|               | Midwestern University              | 10 -                        | 27        | 4          | -               | -     |
|               | West City Community College        | 9 43                        | 3         | 1          | 10              | 3     |
|               | Northtown Community College        | 2 15                        | 2         | 2          | 2               | -     |
|               | Oak Creek Vo.Tech.                 | NA NA                       | NA        | NA         | NA              | NA    |
|               |                                    | 41 311                      | 54        | 18         | 21              | 5     |

Note. Questionnaire not administered (NA) at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech.

<sup>a</sup>Across sites, 16 respondents did not indicate their occupational positions.

<sup>b</sup>Includes responses of Teacher Aides.

Table E-16  
Total (All Sites) BORN FREE Team Member Responses to  
Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |       |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes   | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 0                              | 0      | 100.0 | 0     |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 0                              | 0      | 100.0 | 0     |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 0                              | 0      | 100.0 | 0     |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 0                              | 0      | 100.0 | 0     |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 0                              | 0      | 100.0 | 0     |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 0                              | 0      | 97.2  | 2.8   |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 5.6                            | 0      | 86.1  | 8.3   |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 11.1                           | 50.0   | 38.9  | 0     |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 13.9                           | 33.3   | 50.0  | 2.8   |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 11.1                           | 19.4   | 66.7  | 2.8   |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 0                              | 0      | 97.2  | 2.8   |

Note. Questionnaire was not administered at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 36.

Table E-17  
Total (All Sites) Female Responses to  
Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 19.2                           | 9.2    | 70.3 | 1.3   |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 1.3                            | 3.8    | 93.3 | 1.7   |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 5.0                            | 4.2    | 88.7 | 2.1   |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 23.8                           | .8     | 74.1 | 1.3   |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 62.8                           | 1.7    | 34.3 | 1.3   |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 22.2                           | 9.2    | 63.2 | 5.4   |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 30.5                           | 18.0   | 43.9 | 7.5   |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 15.5                           | 65.7   | 13.4 | 5.4   |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 7.1                            | 69.5   | 17.2 | 6.3   |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 9.6                            | 61.9   | 23.0 | 5.4   |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 4.2                            | 15.5   | 76.6 | 3.8   |

**Note.** Questionnaire was not administered at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 239.



Table E-18  
Total (All Sites) Male Responses to  
Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 27.4                           | 14.2   | 55.7 | 2.8   |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 11.3                           | 13.2   | 75.5 | 0     |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 7.5                            | 8.5    | 80.2 | 3.8   |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 28.3                           | 1.9    | 68.9 | .9    |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 73.1                           | 2.8    | 24.1 | 0     |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 40.1                           | 10.8   | 45.8 | 3.3   |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 44.8                           | 15.6   | 34.4 | 5.2   |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 20.3                           | 59.0   | 17.5 | 3.3   |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 23.1                           | 65.1   | 9.0  | 2.8   |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 15.6                           | 54.2   | 25.5 | 4.7   |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 23.1                           | 25.5   | 48.1 | 3.3   |

Note. Questionnaire was not administered at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 212.

Table E-19  
Total (All Sites) Teacher Responses to  
Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 27.1                           | 13.5   | 57.8 | 1.7   |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 8.3                            | 10.6   | 79.9 | 1.3   |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 7.6                            | 7.3    | 82.5 | 2.6   |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 22.4                           | 2.0    | 73.9 | 1.7   |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 70.6                           | 3.0    | 25.7 | .7    |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 33.7                           | 10.9   | 52.1 | 3.3   |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 40.3                           | 16.8   | 37.3 | 5.6   |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 20.5                           | 64.4   | 11.9 | 3.3   |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 15.8                           | 68.3   | 12.9 | 3.0   |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 11.9                           | 61.7   | 22.1 | 4.3   |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 18.2                           | 24.8   | 52.8 | 4.3   |

Note. Questionnaire was not administered at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 303.

Table E-20  
Total (All Sites) Administrator Responses to  
Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 7.3                            | 9.8    | 80.5 | 2.4   |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 2.4                            | 4.9    | 92.7 | 0     |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 2.4                            | 2.4    | 90.2 | 4.9   |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 17.1                           | 0      | 82.9 | 0     |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 41.5                           | 0      | 58.5 | 0     |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 19.5                           | 4.9    | 70.7 | 4.9   |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 24.4                           | 17.1   | 51.2 | 7.3   |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 17.1                           | 48.8   | 29.3 | 4.9   |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 12.2                           | 68.3   | 14.6 | 4.9   |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 22.0                           | 39.0   | 34.1 | 4.9   |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?                                                     | 2.4                            | 4.9    | 92.7 | 0     |

Note. Questionnaire was not administered at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 41.

Table E-21  
Total (All Sites) Counselor/Student Personnel Worker  
Responses to Project Impact Questionnaire (In Percentages)

| Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Response Category <sup>a</sup> |        |      |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                | No                             | Unsure | Yes  | Blank |
| 1. In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?                                                                                 | 16.7                           | 5.6    | 74.1 | 3.7   |
| 2. In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?                                                          | 0                              | 1.9    | 98.1 | 0     |
| 3. Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?                                                                       | 1.9                            | 5.6    | 88.9 | 3.7   |
| 4. Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)                                                                   | 40.7                           | 0      | 59.3 | 0     |
| 5. Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)        | 66.7                           | 0      | 33.3 | 0     |
| 6. As a result of the Project, have you become more aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?                                              | 31.5                           | 7.4    | 53.7 | 7.4   |
| 7. Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?                                                                       | 33.3                           | 18.5   | 38.9 | 9.3   |
| 8. As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?                                                                 | 11.1                           | 55.6   | 24.1 | 9.3   |
| 9. Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?                                                                                   | 14.8                           | 61.1   | 13.0 | 11.1  |
| 10. As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options? | 14.8                           | 53.7   | 22.2 | 9.3   |
| 11. Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, repeated concerns or activities?                                                       | 0                              | 13.0   | 83.3 | 3.7   |

Note. Questionnaire was not administered at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech.

<sup>a</sup>N for each question = 54.



Table E-22  
Summary of Correlations Between Total (All Sites)  
Responses to Questions on Project Impact Questionnaire

|      | Questions on Project Impact Questionnaire <sup>a</sup> |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
|      | (1)                                                    | (2)   | (3)   | (4)   | (5)   | (6)   | (7)   | (8)   | (9)   | (10)  | (11) |
| (1)  | 1.00                                                   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |
| (2)  | .36**                                                  | 1.00  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |
| (3)  | .07                                                    | .06   | 1.00  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |
| (4)  | -.02                                                   | -.03  | .31** | 1.00  |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |
| (5)  | .16**                                                  | .05   | .17** | .26** | 1.00  |       |       |       |       |       |      |
| (6)  | .19**                                                  | .27** | .29** | .29** | .24** | 1.00  |       |       |       |       |      |
| (7)  | .19**                                                  | .19** | .19** | .23** | .25** | .61** | 1.00  |       |       |       |      |
| (8)  | .07                                                    | .08   | .07   | .02   | .20** | .23** | .34** | 1.00  |       |       |      |
| (9)  | .06                                                    | .22** | .15** | .09   | .12*  | .32** | .26** | .47** | 1.00  |       |      |
| (10) | .01                                                    | .16** | .08   | .03   | .15** | .28** | .30** | .44** | .41** | 1.00  |      |
| (11) | .35**                                                  | .47** | .14** | .03   | .20** | .40** | .34** | .26** | .31** | .25** | 1.00 |

- (1) In general, do you feel that students' career options are limited by sex-role stereotyping?
- (2) In general, should educational institutions systematically attempt to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping?
- (3) Are you aware of Project BORN FREE and the Project activities that have occurred at your institution?
- (4) Have you been a participant in any BORN FREE activities conducted at your institutions? (e.g., workshops)
- (5) Have you assisted or cooperated with your institution's BORN FREE team in planning or conducting BORN FREE activities? (e.g., using Project materials with students)
- (6) As a result of the Project, have you become aware of the need to open up career options and reduce sex-role stereotyping?
- (7) Has the Project resulted in reducing your own sex-role stereotyping behaviors (verbal and nonverbal)?
- (8) As a result of the Project, has the faculty/staff as a whole reduced their sex-role stereotyping behaviors?
- (9) Has the Project reduced the sex-role stereotyping attitudes and/or behaviors of students?
- (10) As a result of the Project, have changes occurred in your institution's policies or procedures that will reduce sex-role stereotyping that limit students' career options?
- (11) Do you feel that the Project concerns or activities should be continued as ongoing, integrated concerns or activities?

Note. Does not include responses of BORN FREE team members. Questionnaire was administered at 12 of the 14 Project sites, not administered at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech.

<sup>a</sup>In order to maximize number of cases in calculating correlations, cases with missing data were deleted pairwise, not listwise. Therefore, the individual n's vary somewhat between correlations ranging from a low n of 395 to a high n of 427. Test for significance of correlations is two-tailed t-test.

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

\*\*  $p \leq .01$ .

Table E-23  
Comments by Questionnaire Respondents  
at Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)

| Level <sup>a</sup> | Site      | Comments of Respondents                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|--------------------|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Elementary         | Carson    | <p>Should be continued on the awareness level and not on the preaching or intimidating level.</p> <p>I think it is worthwhile.</p> <p>Excellent program!</p> <p>Excellent program. Well organized, implemented</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|                    | Norwood   | <p>Isolated workshops may raise awareness BUT the next step to change attitudes is difficult and hasn't been made.</p> <p>I only participated in this years BORN FREE workshops, but I enjoyed the exposure to sex-role stereotype behaviors.</p> <p>Yes, the more we are aware the more the boys can be allowed to be sensitive and the girls may set higher goals for themselves.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|                    | Glenwood  | <p>I like the idea of career options for both sexes--but much turns me off. I think home, family, etc. is extremely important and it seems to be played down in the program.</p> <p>I believe that the whole idea has backfired. Women have lost their femininity. I believe any woman has a right to equal pay and equal rights.</p> <p>Much of the philosophy and activities will be incorporated into curriculum. (Team member)</p> <p>Majority of staff seemed at least willing to experience our meetings and presentations. Having a social informal format helped reduce any threat and/or pre-conceived notions of BORN FREE. (Team member)</p> <p>Biggest drawback was trying to find <u>time</u> to do these activities in classrooms.</p> |
| Junior High        | Middleton | <p>I was not involved in the Project and really have no feeling as to what the program effects have been.</p> <p>I think you have to give people an opportunity to accept the reality of equal opportunity for both men and women. There exists a certain amount of hostility now because of the forced nature of the program.</p> <p>Very valuable and growing.</p> <p>BORN FREE has done a tremendous job in making people aware of sex stereotyping. Although, it will take many more years of ongoing awareness. We need committees like BORN FREE to continue awareness programs. Great project.</p>                                                                                                                                            |

Table E-23 (continued)

Comments by Questionnaire Respondents  
at Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)

| Level <sup>a</sup> | Site                  | Comments of Respondents                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Junior High        | Middleton (continued) | I have a personal interest in helping develop awareness packets, booklets, reading materials, etc. for PARENTS to explore with their children (family-centered) topics such as role options and career exploration.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|                    | Linden                | <p>I felt that the inservice faculty workshops, planned and conducted by our BORN FREE people, were excellent and very worthwhile.</p> <p>The workshop conducted was an educational experience for me. I think student/teachers workshops would be quite useful in the future.</p> <p>Excellent organization of team and projects in our school.</p> <p>I feel that enough has been done at Junior High level - paths are open but students not really mature enough to take it seriously.</p> <p>Release of some faculty at the expense of other faculty caused hard feelings, negative feelings toward program.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|                    | Valley View           | <p>I would not like to see our school district fund this program if it is to be continued. There are other more important funding programs for this district.</p> <p>The Project has taken away too much teacher time from students. Many of us have already been well indoctrinated to sex-role stereotyping through human relations courses and previous workshops.</p> <p>I feel this Project was too long and that teachers in the Project were gone too much from their classrooms where the real need is. All we received from the Project were the long handouts on boring statistics. Just another federally funded Project that wasted money!</p> <p>I feel the stress for human rights should come from a sense of Christian love for each other and not from assertiveness - getting what one deserves. (Team member)</p> <p>Waste of tax dollars, staff time, etc.</p> |
| Senior High        | Morningside           | <p>This has been a delightful experience for our school.</p> <p>I think female activities and meetings should involve male Ex. Growing up female - Bring a male to this.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

Table E-23(continued)  
Comments by Questionnaire Respondents  
at Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)

| Level <sup>a</sup>    | Site                    | Comments of Respondents                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Senior High           | Morningside (continued) | <p>Creates more animosity than it alleviates.</p> <p>The changes that have occurred so far are difficult to attribute to this Project because there are other forces at work with similar objectives.</p> <p>Hopefully, next year will be a better year for the school. Given the state of affairs this year, very little could be expected or realized. (Team member)</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Central               |                         | <p>This institution and its clientele still have a long way to go before sex-role stereotyping becomes a thing of the past. We need more effort.</p> <p>Impact has been minimal at best. I did find the activities interesting.</p> <p>Waste of mankind's money and energies -- making an issue out of nothingness! I'M NOT A SEXIST EITHER.</p> <p>Progress still needs to be made.</p> <p>The goals as listed on reverse are fine - In my case - many at our school would agree - the speakers brought in were of such poor quality that they did the goals more harm than good.</p> |
| Postsecondary         | Parkside College        | <p>The BORN FREE format was not an acceptable approach for this college.</p> <p>My contact has been minimal but positive.</p> <p>It's hard to make me <u>more</u> aware.</p> <p>This is too early to give feedback or results -- much is being planned. (Team member)</p> <p>Major implementation, dissemination will occur in 1978-79 school years. (Team member)</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Midwestern University |                         | <p>I learned very indirectly that CLA was participating in the Project. I was disappointed that we hadn't heard anything about it.</p> <p>Visibility of activities was low. I was invited to join one "group" (which I could not fit into my schedule), but was unaware of any other activities.</p> <p>I would be more supportive of the Project if it had more minority women concerns as a major component in its operation.</p>                                                                                                                                                    |



Table E-23 (continued)

Comments by Questionnaire Respondents  
at Each Site (Sites Grouped by Levels)

| Level <sup>a</sup>                   |  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Site                                 |  | Comments of Respondents                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Postsecondary                        |  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Midwestern<br>University (continued) |  | <p>I wholeheartedly support the BORN FREE Project; it was not convenient for me to attend any of the workshops and I was cognizant of many of the issues discussed. I hope other staff members learned about the harms of stereotyping through the Project.</p> <p>My awareness and participation was limited to one Network meeting, therefore I don't feel that my evaluation is based on adequate exposure to the program.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| West City<br>Community<br>College    |  | <p>An eye opening Project - well conceived and executed - created an awareness of need and some change in attitudes.</p> <p>If "sex-role stereotyping" is a problem, we should identify it and deal with it on an individual basis. Projects using terms like "sex-role stereotyping" are not likely to be helpful.</p> <p>Sex-role stereotyping is subtle and the more obvious areas have been looked at. (Team member)</p> <p>I felt it was at best a waste of time and in many ways a disservice to students telling them that women should feel inferior in traditional roles which isn't necessarily so. (Male)</p> <p>I think the students' stereotyping here is more of a hindrance than that of the faculty or administration.</p> |
| Northtown<br>Community<br>College    |  | <p>I feel that this is a very poor questionnaire -- Seeking approval, but no information. The Project is not responsible for my awarenesses - or changes therein - but my own field of study and professional and personal development have caused any changes that may have taken place.</p> <p>No prior contact or awareness of the Project.</p> <p>Difficult to achieve results with a "band aid" approach, however well intentioned. Many changes needed on macrolevel.</p> <p>I am only slightly aware of the Project - should not answer.</p> <p>I am not really aware that the Project has had any impact.</p>                                                                                                                      |

Note. While the actual numbers of comments (and respondents) varied considerably between sites, only five comments are listed for each site in order that each site receives equal representation. Comments that were either too lengthy or unclear were eliminated prior to the randomized selection process.

<sup>a</sup>Data are incomplete for Senior High and Postsecondary levels in that the questionnaire was not administered at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech.

Listing of Change Process Variables

Project Characteristics

- (1) Monthly consultant hours with sites
- (2) Helpfulness/importance of Project Consultants
- (3) Helpfulness/importance of Project Director
- (4) Helpfulness/importance of Project materials
- (5) Helpfulness/importance of Project newsletter
- (6) Helpfulness/importance of All-Project meetings
- (7) Helpfulness/importance of financial support
- (8) Amount of status/prestige conferred by Project participation
- (9) Feelings about general requirement and expectations of Project
- (10) Feelings about field test requirements of Project
- (11) Feelings about evaluation requirements of Project

Institutional Characteristics

- (12) Economic-political state of institution
- (13) Perceived workloads of faculty/staff
- (14) Faculty/staff morale
- (15) Openness of institution's communication channels
- (16) Immediate/building administrative support for Project
- (17) High/central administrative support for Project
- (18) Overall faculty/staff receptiveness to Project (interest)
- (19) Extent of sex-role stereotyping in institution (need)
- (20) Amount of past career education programs/projects at institution
- (21) How well received past career education programs/projects were
- (22) Amount of past Affirmative Action programs/projects at institution
- (23) How well received past Affirmative Action programs/projects were
- (24) Institution's present involvement with other federal programs/projects
- (25) General relations between female and male faculty/staff
- (26) Overall faculty/staff receptiveness to staff development efforts

Team Characteristics

- (27) Team complete by first quarter
- (28) Both females and males on team
- (29) Counselor in team
- (30) Administrator on team
- (31) Teacher on team
- (32) Cohesiveness of team
- (33) Team leader's commitment to Project
- (34) Other team members' commitment to Project
- (35) All members committed to Project
- (36) Task orientation/planfulness of team
- (37) Maintenance orientation/group support of team
- (38) Team's relations and power with faculty/staff (potency)
- (39) Team's interest in their own self improvement as educators

Implementation Characteristics

- (40) Implementation activities were high risk, novel
- (41) Original implementation plans changed
- (42) Conducted more activities than originally planned
- (43) Conducted less activities than originally planned
- (44) Amount of implementation activities
- (45) Conducted major involuntary faculty/staff inservice
- (46) Conducted voluntary inservices/workshops
- (47) Attempted permanent change (e.g., curriculum development)
- (48) Size of target audience
- (49) Students included in target audience
- (50) Parents included in target audience
- (51) Developed formal continuation plans for next year

Table E-24

Summary of Correlations Between Change Process Variables: Project Characteristics  
With Project, Institutional, Team and Implementation Characteristics

| Change Process Variables      |      | Project Characteristics |       |      |       |      |        |        |       |      |        |        |
|-------------------------------|------|-------------------------|-------|------|-------|------|--------|--------|-------|------|--------|--------|
|                               |      | (1)                     | (2)   | (3)  | (4)   | (5)  | (6)    | (7)    | (8)   | (9)  | (10)   | (11)   |
| Project Characteristics       | (1)  | 1.00                    |       |      |       |      |        |        |       |      |        |        |
|                               | (2)  | .30                     | 1.00  |      |       |      |        |        |       |      |        |        |
|                               | (3)  | -.01                    | .07   | 1.00 |       |      |        |        |       |      |        |        |
|                               | (4)  | .49                     | .66** | .18  | 1.00  |      |        |        |       |      |        |        |
|                               | (5)  | .69**                   | .48   | -.26 | .57*  | 1.00 |        |        |       |      |        |        |
|                               | (6)  | -.16                    | -.26  | .51  | -.30  | -.48 | 1.00   |        |       |      |        |        |
|                               | (7)  | -.37                    | -.26  | .44  | -.35  | -.32 | .61*   | 1.00   |       |      |        |        |
|                               | (8)  | .21                     | .30   | -.17 | .30   | .13  | -.48   | -.43   | 1.00  |      |        |        |
|                               | (9)  | -.33                    | -.57* | .10  | -.53* | -.46 | .39    | .12    | .53*  | 1.00 |        |        |
|                               | (10) | -.03                    | -.33  | .38  | -.02  | -.20 | .72**  | .23    | -.35  | .52  | 1.00   |        |
|                               | (11) | .08                     | -.06  | -.09 | .21   | .09  | .06    | -.35   | .03   | .34  | .44    | 1.00   |
| Institutional Characteristics | (12) | -.17                    | .19   | -.22 | .11   | -.02 | -.57*  | -.04   | .30   | -.43 | -.86** | -.48   |
|                               | (13) | .07                     | .11   | .02  | -.13  | .30  | -.01   | .46    | -.13  | -.28 | -.27   | -.65** |
|                               | (14) | -.05                    | .40   | -.22 | .27   | .24  | -.80** | -.41   | .67** | -.44 | -.79** | -.15   |
|                               | (15) | -.01                    | .25   | -.16 | .23   | -.02 | -.61*  | -.52   | .59*  | -.41 | -.68** | -.18   |
|                               | (16) | .11                     | .20   | .12  | .20   | -.10 | -.45   | -.42   | .25   | -.20 | -.57*  | -.04   |
|                               | (17) | .14                     | .50   | -.40 | .13   | .46  | -.76** | -.54*  | .59*  | -.43 | -.70** | -.13   |
|                               | (18) | -.04                    | .25   | -.12 | .27   | .15  | -.69** | -.52   | .83** | -.46 | -.63*  | -.19   |
|                               | (19) | .13                     | -.19  | .09  | -.42  | .09  | .53*   | .47    | -.50  | .21  | .48    | -.02   |
|                               | (20) | -.10                    | -.04  | -.20 | -.10  | -.24 | -.51   | -.36   | .21   | -.06 | -.71** | -.40   |
|                               | (21) | .25                     | .19   | -.32 | .11   | .28  | .63*   | -.69** | .56*  | -.41 | -.57*  | -.25   |
|                               | (22) | .27                     | .11   | .24  | .36   | .07  | -.39   | -.51   | .12   | .05  | -.10   | .49    |
|                               | (23) | .24                     | .17   | -.35 | .44   | .22  | -.47   | -.79** | .27   | -.10 | .03    | .57*   |
|                               | (24) | -.44                    | .02   | .29  | .22   | -.11 | .25    | .33    | .28   | .12  | .46    | .35    |
|                               | (25) | -.31                    | .27   | -.44 | .29   | -.08 | -.51   | -.36   | .63*  | -.49 | -.53*  | .03    |
|                               | (26) | -.19                    | .02   | -.27 | .10   | -.18 | -.53*  | -.43   | .64** | -.32 | -.60*  | -.30   |

Table E-24 (continued)

Summary of Correlations Between Change Process Variables: Project Characteristics  
With Project, Institutional, Team and Implementation Characteristics

| Change Process Variables       |      | Project Characteristics |       |       |       |       |       |      |        |       |      |       |
|--------------------------------|------|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|-------|------|-------|
|                                |      | (1)                     | (2)   | (3)   | (4)   | (5)   | (6)   | (7)  | (8)    | (9)   | (10) | (11)  |
| Team Characteristics           | (27) | .33                     | .43   | .66** | .50   | .37   | .10   | .32  | .04    | -.34  | .09  | -.10  |
|                                | (28) | .01                     | .25   | .53*  | .31   | -.20  | .52   | .40  | -.19   | -.14  | .30  | .06   |
|                                | (29) | .38                     | .36   | -.26  | .03   | .35   | .06   | .19  | -.16   | -.39  | -.33 | -.27  |
|                                | (30) | .27                     | .03   | .04   | .07   | .02   | .34   | .19  | -.40   | .24   | .14  | .03   |
|                                | (31) | -.02                    | .04   | .44   | .30   | .17   | -.04  | .15  | .30    | -.30  | .19  | .28   |
|                                | (32) | .16                     | .54*  | -.12  | .53*  | .38   | -.54* | -.52 | .46    | -.27  | -.28 | .31   |
|                                | (33) | .59*                    | .59*  | .48   | .50   | .40   | .11   | .13  | .02    | -.50  | -.09 | -.18  |
|                                | (34) | .31                     | .55*  | .16   | .57*  | .45   | -.16  | -.22 | .40    | -.40  | -.23 | .16   |
|                                | (35) | -.43                    | .28   | -.25  | .11   | .06   | -.45  | -.17 | .71**  | -.26  | -.41 | -.25  |
|                                | (36) | .52                     | .67** | .16   | .75** | .71** | -.46  | -.26 | .32    | -.57* | -.35 | .03   |
|                                | (37) | .17                     | .23   | -.48  | .37   | .10   | -.23  | -.42 | .08    | -.08  | -.09 | .30   |
|                                | (38) | -.05                    | .58*  | .35   | .66** | .25   | -.23  | -.16 | .66**  | -.44  | -.05 | .23   |
|                                | (39) | .29                     | .53*  | .06   | .62*  | .33   | -.16  | -.17 | .20    | -.30  | -.26 | .04   |
| Implementation Characteristics | (40) | .01                     | .49   | .26   | .16   | .17   | -.27  | -.19 | .52    | -.34  | -.44 | -.15  |
|                                | (41) | .27                     | -.21  | .44   | -.12  | -.13  | .46   | .36  | -.34   | .12   | .19  | -.21  |
|                                | (42) | .13                     | .39   | .32   | .22   | .24   | -.03  | .03  | .53*   | -.38  | -.19 | .03   |
|                                | (43) | .07                     | -.52  | 0     | -.30  | -.32  | .35   | .22  | -.75** | .45   | .32  | -.17  |
|                                | (44) | .55*                    | .38   | .35   | .38   | .47   | -.32  | -.22 | .06    | -.22  | -.35 | .13   |
|                                | (45) | -.06                    | -.25  | .56*  | .26   | -.15  | .25   | .43  | -.04   | .04   | .23  | .10   |
|                                | (46) | .54*                    | .35   | -.27  | 0     | .32   | -.35  | -.52 | 0      | -.15  | -.32 | -.17  |
|                                | (47) | .16                     | -.06  | .24   | .21   | .09   | .27   | -.17 | .21    | -.03  | .44  | .15   |
|                                | (48) | .44                     | -.23  | .42   | -.07  | .11   | .37   | .39  | -.31   | -.21  | .09  | -.23  |
|                                | (49) | .35                     | .10   | .29   | -.04  | .06   | .25   | .28  | -.50   | .04   | -.09 | -.60* |
|                                | (50) | .41                     | .27   | .42   | .16   | .17   | .15   | .17  | -.39   | .03   | -.06 | .28   |
|                                | (51) | .12                     | .16   | .66** | .09   | -.24  | .21   | .27  | .09    | -.24  | -.14 | -.39  |

Note. Each of the 14 Project sites received one rating on each listed change process variable; thus, the n for each change process variable is 14. A listing and explanation of the 51 change process variables are provided on the adjacent page.

\*  $p \leq .05$  (two tailed)

\*\*  $p \leq .01$  (two tailed)



Table E-25

Summary of Correlations Between Change Process Variables: Institutional Characteristics With Institutional, Team, and Implementation Characteristics

| Change Process                   |       | Institutional Characteristics |       |       |        |       |       |        |        |       |       |      |      |       |      |      |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|------|------|-------|------|------|
| Variables                        |       | (12)                          | (13)  | (14)  | (15)   | (16)  | (17)  | (18)   | (19)   | (20)  | (21)  | (22) | (23) | (24)  | (25) | (26) |
| Institutional<br>Characteristics | (12)  | 1.00                          |       |       |        |       |       |        |        |       |       |      |      |       |      |      |
|                                  | (13)  | .33                           | 1.00  |       |        |       |       |        |        |       |       |      |      |       |      |      |
|                                  | (14)  | .70**                         | .08   | 1.00  |        |       |       |        |        |       |       |      |      |       |      |      |
|                                  | (15)  | .70**                         | -.01  | .80** | 1.00   |       |       |        |        |       |       |      |      |       |      |      |
|                                  | (16)  | .57*                          | -.14  | .63*  | .87**  | 1.00  |       |        |        |       |       |      |      |       |      |      |
|                                  | (17)  | .40                           | .23   | .80** | .56*   | .34   | 1.00  |        |        |       |       |      |      |       |      |      |
|                                  | (18)  | .60*                          | .04   | .88** | .86**  | .62*  | .71** | 1.00   |        |       |       |      |      |       |      |      |
|                                  | (19)  | -.70**                        | .27   | -.62* | -.72** | -.63* | -.26  | -.69** | 1.00   |       |       |      |      |       |      |      |
|                                  | (20)  | .76**                         | -.01  | .61*  | .79**  | .74** | .34   | .63*   | -.70** | 1.00  |       |      |      |       |      |      |
|                                  | (21)  | .36                           | .06   | .58*  | .76**  | .58*  | .65** | .77**  | -.38   | .59*  | 1.00  |      |      |       |      |      |
| (22)                             | .06   | -.45                          | .38   | .44   | .68**  | .23   | .34   | -.41   | .23    | .21   | 1.00  |      |      |       |      |      |
| (23)                             | -.05  | -.48                          | .15   | .28   | .24    | .27   | .22   | -.41   | .02    | .29   | .58*  | 1.00 |      |       |      |      |
| (24)                             | -.27  | -.21                          | -.04  | -.35  | -.44   | -.24  | -.08  | .01    | -.50   | -.58* | -.09  | -.11 | 1.00 |       |      |      |
| (25)                             | .62*  | -.27                          | .52   | .59*  | .36    | .30   | .51   | -.71** | .41    | .34   | .08   | .42  | .04  | 1.00  |      |      |
| (26)                             | .73** | -.03                          | .69** | .86** | .60*   | .41   | .84** | -.80** | .82**  | .65** | .14   | .19  | -.18 | .65** | 1.00 |      |
| Team<br>Characteristics          | (27)  | -.05                          | .34   | .10   | -.17   | -.07  | .08   | .05    | .10    | -.37  | -.27  | .18  | -.21 | .36   | -.34 | -.29 |
|                                  | (28)  | -.18                          | -.27  | -.42  | -.43   | -.24  | -.53* | -.43   | .02    | -.38  | -.57* | -.10 | -.15 | .34   | .04  | -.36 |
|                                  | (29)  | .12                           | .30   | -.01  | -.03   | -.04  | .05   | -.19   | .31    | -.04  | .10   | -.46 | -.42 | -.31  | .04  | -.17 |
|                                  | (30)  | -.08                          | -.05  | -.14  | -.20   | -.11  | -.33  | -.30   | .08    | .06   | -.34  | -.21 | -.41 | .11   | -.32 | -.12 |
|                                  | (31)  | -.20                          | .06   | .05   | -.02   | .06   | -.03  | .11    | .11    | -.46  | -.06  | .38  | .13  | .38   | .03  | -.23 |
|                                  | (32)  | .22                           | -.07  | .69** | .62*   | .53*  | .58*  | .55*   | -.37   | .20   | .38   | .55* | .43  | .10   | .29  | .32  |
|                                  | (33)  | -.02                          | .26   | .17   | .07    | .17   | .15   | .09    | .15    | -.15  | .01   | .14  | -.28 | .01   | -.30 | -.16 |
|                                  | (34)  | .27                           | .25   | .42   | .46    | .41   | .37   | .48    | -.37   | .08   | .32   | .25  | .12  | .01   | .15  | .25  |
|                                  | (35)  | .43                           | .14   | .69** | .52    | .17   | .51   | .67**  | -.38   | .37   | .42   | -.18 | -.12 | .30   | .47  | .60* |
|                                  | (36)  | .26                           | .20   | .56*  | .43    | .44   | .45   | .46    | -.24   | .07   | .36   | .39  | .11  | -.01  | .10  | .12  |
|                                  | (37)  | .24                           | -.17  | .19   | .23    | .07   | .15   | .39    | -.45   | .18   | -.05  | .13  | .55* | .03   | .40  | .32  |
|                                  | (38)  | .09                           | -.09  | .52   | .38    | .29   | .33   | .52    | -.33   | -.12  | .14   | .39  | .19  | .54*  | .30  | .20  |
|                                  | (39)  | .41                           | .16   | .44   | .48    | .42   | .18   | .37    | -.48   | .29   | .15   | .16  | .02  | .07   | .21  | .36  |

Table E-25(continued)

Summary of Correlations Between Change Process Variables: Institutional Characteristics With Institutional, Team, and Implementation Characteristics

| Change Process Variables       |      | Institutional Characteristics |      |       |      |      |       |       |      |      |      |      |       |      |       |      |
|--------------------------------|------|-------------------------------|------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|
|                                |      | (12)                          | (13) | (14)  | (15) | (16) | (17)  | (18)  | (19) | (20) | (21) | (22) | (23)  | (24) | (25)  | (26) |
| Implementation Characteristics | (40) | .33                           | .27  | .55*  | .46  | .41  | .66** | .63*  | -.31 | .22  | .43  | .27  | .03   | -.09 | .12   | .30  |
|                                | (41) | -.03                          | .38  | -.27  | -.19 | -.08 | -.24  | -.15  | .11  | -.03 | -.27 | -.06 | -.33  | -.09 | -.53* | -.09 |
|                                | (42) | .05                           | .12  | .44   | .17  | .10  | .44   | .46   | -.06 | -.10 | .11  | .12  | -.24  | .33  | -.05  | .10  |
|                                | (43) | -.06                          | .16  | -.61* | -.29 | -.15 | -.58* | -.54* | .14  | .07  | -.29 | -.16 | 0     | -.38 | -.33  | -.16 |
|                                | (44) | .14                           | 0    | .45   | .30  | .55* | .38   | .33   | -.15 | .16  | .27  | .63* | 0     | -.20 | -.19  | -.04 |
|                                | (45) | .05                           | -.18 | -.10  | -.19 | -.03 | -.53* | -.05  | -.24 | -.09 | -.46 | .14  | -.28  | .52  | -.06  | -.03 |
|                                | (46) | -.06                          | 0    | .28   | .18  | .15  | .58*  | .18   | .14  | .22  | .43  | .16  | .16   | -.49 | -.20  | -.05 |
|                                | (47) | -.48                          | -.27 | -.28  | -.03 | -.04 | -.30  | .03   | .15  | -.22 | .28  | -.08 | -.03  | .09  | -.12  | -.05 |
|                                | (48) | -.12                          | .29  | -.38  | -.25 | -.05 | -.31  | -.23  | .34  | -.21 | -.06 | -.07 | -.36  | -.31 | -.42  | -.29 |
|                                | (49) | .05                           | .29  | -.21  | -.19 | -.03 | -.23  | -.24  | .18  | .22  | -.02 | -.34 | -.61* | -.36 | -.45  | -.14 |
|                                | (50) | -.12                          | -.11 | .10   | -.11 | .29  | -.05  | -.25  | .19  | -.14 | -.28 | .46  | -.17  | -.09 | -.35  | -.46 |
| (51)                           | .21  | .21                           | .26  | .32   | .43  | .02  | .30   | -.08  | .26  | .04  | .21  | .44  | .01   | -.22 | .23   |      |

Note. Each of the 14 Project sites received one rating on each listed change process variable; thus, the n for each change process variable is 14. A listing and explanation of the 51 change process variables are provided on the adjacent page.

\*  $p \leq .05$  (two tailed)

\*\*  $p \leq .01$  (two tailed)

Table E-26

Summary of Correlations Between Change Process Variables:  
Team Characteristics With Team and Implementation Characteristics

| Change Process Variables |                 | Team Characteristics |       |      |      |       |       |        |       |       |       |       |      |        |      |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|------|
|                          |                 | (27)                 | (28)  | (29) | (30) | (31)  | (32)  | (33)   | (34)  | (35)  | (36)  | (37)  | (38) | (39)   |      |
| Team                     | Characteristics | (27)                 | 1.00  |      |      |       |       |        |       |       |       |       |      |        |      |
|                          |                 | (28)                 | .41   | 1.00 |      |       |       |        |       |       |       |       |      |        |      |
|                          |                 | (29)                 | -.10  | .05  | 1.00 |       |       |        |       |       |       |       |      |        |      |
|                          |                 | (30)                 | .04   | .14  | .39  | 1.00  |       |        |       |       |       |       |      |        |      |
|                          |                 | (31)                 | .47   | .19  | -.21 | -.55* | 1.00  |        |       |       |       |       |      |        |      |
|                          |                 | (32)                 | .13   | -.42 | 0    | 0     | .18   | 1.00   |       |       |       |       |      |        |      |
|                          |                 | (33)                 | .75** | .29  | .38  | .38   | .19   | .31    | 1.00  |       |       |       |      |        |      |
|                          |                 | (34)                 | .42   | -.05 | .16  | .06   | .20   | .57*   | .50   | 1.00  |       |       |      |        |      |
|                          |                 | (35)                 | -.13  | -.41 | .10  | -.04  | -.06  | .51    | -.05  | .23   | 1.00  |       |      |        |      |
|                          |                 | (36)                 | .52   | -.09 | .32  | .08   | .36   | .72**  | .68** | .73** | .30   | 1.00  |      |        |      |
| Implementation           | Characteristics | (37)                 | -.18  | -.09 | .11  | .31   | -.46  | .39    | -.07  | .19   | .06   | .04   | 1.00 |        |      |
|                          |                 | (38)                 | .53*  | .12  | -.13 | -.17  | .60*  | -.71** | .45   | .61*  | .51   | .69** | .03  | 1.00   |      |
|                          |                 | (39)                 | .27   | -.03 | .28  | .52   | -.17  | .63*   | .52   | .78** | .36   | .69** | .50  | .49    | 1.00 |
|                          |                 | (40)                 | .45   | -.06 | -.15 | -.39  | .21   | .31    | .32   | .63*  | .25   | .40   | -.17 | .48    | .21  |
|                          |                 | (41)                 | .47   | .19  | -.21 | .30   | -.17  | -.36   | .35   | .20   | -.47  | -.14  | .02  | -.24   | .13  |
|                          |                 | (42)                 | .65** | .14  | .03  | .07   | .30   | .26    | .62*  | .57*  | .26   | .44   | -.16 | .59*   | .30  |
|                          |                 | (43)                 | -.29  | 0    | -.17 | .15   | -.41  | -.50   | -.35  | -.40  | -.58* | -.53* | .17  | -.73** | -.20 |
|                          |                 | (44)                 | .53*  | 0    | .13  | .11   | .30   | .42    | .64** | .53*  | -.11  | .73** | -.21 | .38    | .38  |
|                          |                 | (45)                 | .46   | .55* | -.25 | .26   | .35   | -.26   | .18   | .07   | -.17  | .07   | -.16 | .21    | .15  |
|                          |                 | (46)                 | 0     | -.32 | .17  | .15   | -.41  | .25    | .35   | -.08  | 0     | .18   | .17  | -.15   | 0    |
|                          |                 | (47)                 | -.10  | .06  | .15  | .03   | .28   | 0      | .10   | .16   | .10   | .17   | -.38 | .23    | .04  |
| (48)                     | .40             | .33                  | .17   | -.02 | .29  | -.54* | .38   | .09    | -.62* | .03   | -.49  | -.26  | -.18 |        |      |
| (49)                     | .17             | .23                  | .45   | .56* | -.47 | -.38  | .42   | -.09   | -.17  | .07   | -.28  | -.38  | .15  |        |      |
| (50)                     | .45             | .33                  | .27   | .34  | .21  | .15   | .60*  | .24    | -.45  | .40   | -.17  | .13   | .21  |        |      |
| (51)                     | .56*            | .19                  | -.03  | .24  | .12  | .13   | .71** | .28    | .04   | .29   | -.19  | .33   | .34  |        |      |

Note. Each of the 14 Project sites received one rating on each listed change process variable; thus, the n for each change process variable is 14. A listing and explanation of the 51 change process variables are provided on the adjacent page.

\*  $p \leq .05$  (two tailed)

\*\*  $p \leq .01$  (two tailed)

Table E-27

Summary of Correlations Between Change Process Variables:  
Implementation Characteristics With Implementation Characteristics

| Change Process Variables       |      | Implementation Characteristics |      |        |      |       |       |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|--------------------------------|------|--------------------------------|------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                                |      | (40)                           | (41) | (42)   | (43) | (44)  | (45)  | (46) | (47) | (48) | (49) | (50) | (51) |
| Implementation Characteristics | (40) | 1.00                           |      |        |      |       |       |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|                                | (41) | .21                            | 1.00 |        |      |       |       |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|                                | (42) | .70**                          | .30  | 1.00   |      |       |       |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|                                | (43) | -.52                           | .41  | -.75** | 1.00 |       |       |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|                                | (44) | .51                            | .15  | .55*   | -.42 | 1.00  |       |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|                                | (45) | -.10                           | .35  | .26    | 0    | .21   | 1.00  |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|                                | (46) | .17                            | 0    | .15    | -.14 | .32   | -.58* | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |
|                                | (47) | -.15                           | -.21 | .02    | -.17 | 0     | .10   | -.17 | 1.00 |      |      |      |      |
|                                | (48) | .10                            | .61* | .21    | .22  | .32   | .38   | -.11 | .17  | 1.00 |      |      |      |
|                                | (49) | -.10                           | .35  | -.04   | .29  | .21   | .13   | .29  | .10  | .38  | 1.00 |      |      |
|                                | (50) | .15                            | .21  | .34    | -.17 | .77** | .25   | .17  | -.15 | .37  | .25  | 1.00 |      |
|                                | (51) | .39                            | .55* | .56*   | .15  | .44   | .34   | .15  | -.03 | .36  | .34  | .39  | 1.00 |

Note. Each of the 14 Project sites received one rating on each listed change process variable; thus, the n for each change process variable is 14. A listing and explanation of the 51 change process variables are provided on the adjacent page.

\*  $p \leq .05$  (two tailed)

\*\*  $p \leq .01$  (two tailed)



Table E-28

Summary of Correlations Between Change Process Variables (Project, Institutional, Team, and Implementation Characteristics and Total (All Sites) Responses on Project Impact Questionnaire

| Change Process Variables <sup>a</sup> |      | Questions on Project Impact Questionnaire <sup>b</sup> |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|---------------------------------------|------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                                       |      | (1)                                                    | (2)   | (3)   | (4)   | (5)   | (6)   | (7)   | (8)   | (9)   | (10)  | (11)  |
| Project Characteristics               | (1)  | .05                                                    | 0     | -.02  | -.27* | 0     | -.04  | .01   | .01   | .07   | .04   | -.03  |
|                                       | (2)  | .08                                                    | -.04  | -.01  | -.09  | .07   | .03   | .13   | .11   | .13   | .16*  | .06   |
|                                       | (3)  | -.23*                                                  | -.20* | -.04  | .12   | -.11  | -.03  | .07   | -.14  | -.13  | .03   | -.32* |
|                                       | (4)  | -.07                                                   | -.11  | .03   | .01   | -.03  | .03   | .09   | .10   | .09   | .15   | -.12  |
|                                       | (5)  | .07                                                    | -.01  | .06   | -.14  | .12   | .07   | .15   | .13   | .17*  | .14   | .11   |
|                                       | (6)  | -.16*                                                  | -.05  | -.10  | .14   | -.28* | -.23* | -.26* | -.16  | -.16* | -.10  | -.22  |
|                                       | (7)  | -.18*                                                  | .11   | -.06  | .08   | -.10  | -.08  | -.06  | -.04  | -.06  | .06   | -.10  |
|                                       | (8)  | .10                                                    | .07   | -.03  | .07   | .08   | .15   | .16*  | .18*  | .12   | .08   | .18*  |
|                                       | (9)  | -.08                                                   | -.03  | -.16* | .05   | -.02  | -.08  | -.16* | -.21* | -.13  | -.16* | -.16* |
|                                       | (10) | -.16*                                                  | -.03  | -.01  | -.10  | -.17  | -.10  | -.20  | -.14  | -.10  | -.08  | -.19* |
|                                       | (11) | -.11                                                   | -.02  | .13   | .03   | -.11  | .02   | -.03  | -.05  | .07   | -.02  | -.18* |
| Institutional Characteristics         | (12) | .07                                                    | -.03  | .03   | .25*  | .11   | .09   | .15   | .11   | .02   | .07   | .09   |
|                                       | (13) | .04                                                    | -.06  | -.04  | .03   | .14   | 0     | .10   | .06   | .05   | .15   | .12   |
|                                       | (14) | .10                                                    | -.01  | .10   | .23*  | .24*  | .21*  | .25*  | .14   | .16   | .15   | .13   |
|                                       | (15) | .09                                                    | -.04  | .02   | .27*  | .15   | .13   | .14   | .06   | .01   | .06   | -.02  |
|                                       | (16) | -.01                                                   | -.12  | .05   | .29*  | .08   | .11   | .08   | -.05  | -.06  | .02   | -.20* |
|                                       | (17) | .18*                                                   | .06   | .03   | .01   | .23*  | .16*  | .22*  | .14   | .18*  | .13   | -.24* |
|                                       | (18) | .11                                                    | .02   | .03   | .19*  | .19*  | .18*  | .19*  | .13   | .07   | .06   | .13   |
|                                       | (19) | -.03                                                   | .02   | -.09  | -.27* | -.02  | -.09  | -.08  | -.06  | .04   | .03   | .02   |
|                                       | (20) | .14                                                    | .01   | .07   | .22*  | .15   | .06   | .05   | -.02  | -.10  | -.08  | .04   |
|                                       | (21) | .24*                                                   | .07   | -.04  | -.01  | .21*  | .13   | .15   | .10   | .02   | 0     | .17*  |
|                                       | (22) | -.12                                                   | -.11  | .09   | .23*  | .01   | .13   | .04   | -.09  | 0     | .02   | -.26* |
|                                       | (23) | .03                                                    | .05   | 0     | .02   | -.04  | .07   | .01   | .01   | .04   | -.03  | -.02  |
|                                       | (24) | -.18*                                                  | -.04  | .09   | .11   | -.07  | .02   | 0     | .04   | .08   | .09   | -.05  |
|                                       | (25) | .09                                                    | .08   | -.04  | .14   | -.02  | .10   | .11   | .17*  | .05   | .02   | .13   |
|                                       | (26) | .12                                                    | .06   | 0     | .19*  | .10   | .07   | .07   | .08   | -.03  | -.03  | .11   |

Table E-28(continued)

Summary of Correlations Between Change Process Variables (Project, Institutional, Team, and Implementation Characteristics and Total (All Sites) Responses on Project Impact Questionnaire

| Change Process Variables <sup>a</sup> |      | Questions on Project Impact Questionnaire <sup>b</sup> |      |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |       |
|---------------------------------------|------|--------------------------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|
|                                       |      | (1)                                                    | (2)  | (3)   | (4)   | (5)   | (6)   | (7)   | (8)   | (9)   | (10) | (11)  |
| Team                                  | (27) | -.15                                                   | -.14 | -.02  | .02   | -.01  | .05   | .09   | .04   | .10   | .19* | -.07  |
|                                       | (28) | -.16*                                                  | -.04 | -.15  | -.15  | -.36* | -.12  | -.12  | .01   | -.08  | -.05 | -.14  |
|                                       | (29) | .11                                                    | .01  | -.02  | -.18* | .05   | -.06  | .06   | .10   | .07   | .08  | .08   |
|                                       | (30) | -.02                                                   | -.02 | .14   | -.10  | -.03  | -.16* | -.12  | -.08  | -.01  | -.04 | -.09  |
|                                       | (31) | -.19*                                                  | -.13 | -.06  | .17*  | -.05  | .15   | .11   | .04   | .05   | .14  | -.17* |
|                                       | (32) | -.01                                                   | -.10 | .14   | .20*  | .18*  | .11   | .14   | .03   | .14   | .18* | -.11  |
|                                       | (33) | -.05                                                   | -.10 | -.04  | -.09  | .02   | -.02  | .06   | .03   | .09   | .17* | -.09  |
|                                       | (34) | -.01                                                   | -.12 | .08   | .10   | .05   | .06   | .14   | .09   | .09   | .16* | -.08  |
|                                       | (35) | .12                                                    | .02  | .09   | .14   | .23*  | .10   | .16*  | .13   | .10   | .11  | .18*  |
|                                       | (36) | -.02                                                   | -.13 | .08   | .08   | .13   | .10   | .17*  | .08   | .12   | .20* | -.09  |
| Characteristics                       | (37) | .04                                                    | .06  | .06   | .01   | -.03  | -.06  | -.05  | .02   | .06   | 0    | .03   |
|                                       | (38) | -.10                                                   | -.13 | .04   | .20*  | .06   | .14   | .16*  | .10   | .13   | .22* | -.12  |
|                                       | (39) | -.02                                                   | -.12 | .14   | .13   | .06   | -.03  | .06   | .03   | .05   | .13  | -.13  |
|                                       | (40) | .06                                                    | -.04 | -.01  | .07   | .09   | .13   | .17*  | .09   | .08   | .11  | .09   |
|                                       | (41) | -.14                                                   | -.08 | -.08  | -.03  | -.21* | -.17* | -.17* | -.13  | -.12  | -.04 | -.11  |
|                                       | (42) | .01                                                    | -.01 | .01   | -.01  | .04   | .10   | .15   | .13   | .16*  | .14  | .09   |
|                                       | (43) | -.06                                                   | -.02 | -.04  | 0     | -.11  | -.16* | -.22* | -.18* | -.21* | -.15 | -.13  |
|                                       | (44) | -.05                                                   | -.14 | .11   | .08   | .09   | .13   | .16*  | .01   | .09   | .12  | -.14  |
|                                       | (45) | -.22*                                                  | -.10 | .06   | .15*  | -.16* | 0     | -.04  | -.02  | -.07  | -.02 | -.20* |
|                                       | (46) | .20*                                                   | .12  | -.03  | -.24* | .15   | .01   | .03   | .01   | .10   | 0    | .20*  |
| Implementation                        | (47) | -.01                                                   | -.01 | -.03  | -.13  | -.05  | -.05  | -.07  | -.02  | -.09  | -.07 | -.12  |
|                                       | (48) | -.10                                                   | -.05 | -.18* | -.13  | -.19* | -.04  | -.03  | 0     | -.08  | -.02 | -.09  |
|                                       | (49) | .06                                                    | -.02 | 0     | -.19* | .03   | -.13  | -.07  | -.06  | -.10  | -.06 | .01   |
|                                       | (50) | -.12                                                   | -.13 | .07   | .03   | -.05  | .02   | .03   | -.07  | .05   | .07  | -.22* |
|                                       | (51) | -.12                                                   | -.13 | -.08  | .16*  | -.01  | -.01  | -.01  | -.07  | -.05  | -.09 | -.18* |

Note. Responses of BORN FREE members were not used in these calculations. In order to calculate correlations the change process variable ratings for a given site were added onto all individual questionnaire respondents' files for a site. Because the questionnaire was not administered at Bellevue S.H. and Oak Creek Vo.Tech., the change process variable ratings of these two sites could not be entered into these calculations.

<sup>a</sup>A listing and explanation of change process variables are provided on the adjacent page.

<sup>b</sup>A listing of the questions on the Project Impact Questionnaire is provided on the adjacent page.

\*  $p \leq .001$  (two tailed)